arXiv:1409.2387v2 [math.PR] 29 Feb 2016

QUASISTATIONARY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR ONE-DIMENSIONAL DIFFUSIONS WITH SINGULAR BOUNDARY POINTS

ALEXANDRU HENING AND MARTIN KOLB

Abstract. In the present work we characterize the existence of quasistationary distributions for diffusions on $(0, \infty)$ allowing singular behavior at 0 and infinity. If absorption at 0 is certain, we show that there exists a quasistationary distribution as soon as the spectrum of the generator is strictly positive. This complements results of Collet et al. and Kolb/Steinsaltz for zero being a regular boundary point and extends results by Collet et al. on singular diffusions.

We also study the existence and uniqueness of quasistationary distributions for a class of one-dimensional diffusions with killing that arise from a biological example and which have two inaccessible boundary points (more specifically 0 is natural and ∞ is entrance).

Contents

1. Introduction and main results 2
1.1. Main results 3
1.2. Comparison with existing results 6
1.3. One-dimensional diffusions on the half-line 7
1.4. Outline 9
2. Analytic results 9
2.1. Spectral Theorem for diffusion operators with singularity at 0 10
2.2. Spectral Theorem for entrance boundary at ∞ 16
2.3. Positivity Criterion for the Spectrum 18
3. Yaglom Limits 19
3.1. Natural boundary at ∞ 19
3.2. Applications to Bessel processes 28
3.3. Entrance boundary at ∞ 30
3.4. An application to a diffusion coming from population dynamics 31
4. Study of a class of diffusions with internal killing for which 0 is natural and ∞ entrance 34
4.1. Prelimiting model 35
4.2. The model 36
4.3. Existence of the Yaglom limit 37
References 41

A.H. was supported by EPSRC grant EP/K034316/1.
AMS subject classification Primary 58J05, 60J60; Secondary 35J10, 35P05, 47F05.
Keywords. One-dimensional diffusion, quasistationary distribution

1. Introduction and main results

Consider the one-dimensional diffusion $(X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ that is the solution to the SDE

$$dX_t = dB_t - b(X_t)\,dt,$$

where $(B_t)_{t\geq 0}$ is a standard one-dimensional Brownian motion and b is continuous. The first hitting time of 0 by $(X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ is denoted by

$$T_0 := \inf\{t \geq 0 : X_t = 0\}$$

In the first part of this paper we are interested in the existence of quasistationary distributions of $(X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ with killing at 0. These are invariant measures of the evolution conditioned on not hitting zero. More formally, the following definition captures the main object of interest of this work.

Definition 1.1. *A probability measure ν on $(0,\infty)$ satisfying*

$$\mathbb{P}^\nu(X_t \in A \mid T_0 > t) = \nu(A)$$

for all Borel sets $A \subset (0,\infty)$ is called a quasistationary distribution of $(X_t)_{t\geq 0}$.

The probability measure $\mathbb{P}^\nu$ expresses the fact that X_0 has initial distribution ν. Note that the event $\{T_0 > t\}$ can be interpreted as survival until at least time t. The problem of existence, uniqueness, and the characterization of quasistationary distributions for one-dimensional diffusions as well as for Markov chains is a challenging task in probability. In recent years, these problems have attracted the interest of both probabilists and biologists. Applications to diffusion models arising from mathematical biology have been pointed out in [CCL$^+$09] and for models arising from demography in [SE04]. Some recent developments and a description of the role of quasistationary distributions in models derived from ecology and population dynamics are described in the survey article [MV12].

One possible approach to analyzing the existence question for quasistationary distributions (QSD) is to look at the following limit.

Definition 1.2. *Let ν be a probability measure on $(0,\infty)$. The Yaglom limit of $(X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ is defined by*

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \mathbb{P}^\nu(X_t \in \cdot \mid T_0 > t). \tag{1.1}$$

It is easy to see that if a non-trivial Yaglom limit exists, the limit is a quasistationary distribution (see for example [CCL$^+$09]). Therefore, in order to answer the existence problem for QSDs it is reasonable to look at Yaglom limits. It will turn out that in many situations the Yaglom limit is either non-trivial or trivial in the following sense.

Definition 1.3. *We say that $(X_t)_{t\geq 0}$, started with the initial distribution ν, converges to the quasistatioanry distribution u, if u is a non-negative function and for all Borel measurable sets $A \subset (0,\infty)$*

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \mathbb{P}^\nu(X_t \in A \mid T_0 > t) = \frac{\int_A u(x)\rho(dx)}{\int_0^\infty u(x)\rho(dx)}, \tag{1.2}$$

where $\rho(dx) = \exp\left(-\int_1^x 2b(s)\,ds\right)dx$ is the speed measure of the diffusion.

We say that $(X_t)_{t\geq 0}$, started with the initial distribution ν, escapes to infinity if for every $a \in (0,\infty)$

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \mathbb{P}^\nu(X_t \in [0,a) \mid T_0 > t) = 0.$$

In many cases the convergence to a quasistationary distribution is independent of the initial distribution ν. This follows from our characterization of the convergence to a quasistationary distribution via the strict negativity of the exponential rate of decat of $\mathbb{P}^\nu(T_0 > t)$ and Harnack's inequality.

The main achievement of this work is a better understanding of the Yaglom limit for one-dimensional diffusions. While in [KS12] the existence problem has been solved for regular drift functions as for instance $b \in C^1([0,\infty))$ and internal killing, the present work is concerned with drift functions having a singularity at 0 as for instance variants of the Bessel process corresponding to $b(x) = \frac{a}{x}$.

An interesting application of the singular case is a generalized Feller's diffusion of the type

$$dZ_t = h(Z_t)dt - \sqrt{Z_t}dB_t, \tag{1.3}$$

where h is a nice function. Such stochastic differential equations arise as scaling limits of certain discrete population models as shown in [CCL$^+$09]. If one lets $X_\cdot = 2\sqrt{Z_t}$ then an easy application of Ito's Lemma in (1.3) yields

$$dX_t = -dB_t - \frac{1}{X_t}\left(\frac{1}{2} - 2h\left(\frac{X_t^2}{4}\right)\right)dt \tag{1.4}$$

The SDE for $(X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ has our general form and the drift function has a singularity at zero.

The main arguments of the present work are based on analytic extensions of results given in [Man61] to a wider class of diffusions. This allows one to understand the convergence to quasistationary distributions for compact sets $A \subset (0,\infty)$. From this we can deduce that $(X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ either converges to a quasistationary distribution or escapes to infinity, where we make use of an elegant argument from [SE07]. In many cases this dichotomy can be reduced to understanding the exponential rate of decat of $\mathbb{P}^\nu(T_0 > t)$ which leads to a characterization of the convergence of $(X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ via the positivity of the bottom of the spectrum of the diffusion operator L corresponding to

$$\tau = -\frac{1}{2}\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + b(x)\frac{d}{dx}.$$

Throughout this paper we denote the bottom of the spectrum by

$$\lambda_0 := \inf \operatorname{spec}(L).$$

After one has understood the existence of quasistationary distributions, one may also want to consider the so-called Q-process, that is, the process that arises from the original diffuson when conditioned on non-extinction

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \mathbb{P}^x(X_\bullet \in \cdot \mid T_0 > t).$$

We can deduce properties regarding the existence of the Q-process from our main results for a large class of diffusions by using classical techniques.

1.1. **Main results.** First, recall Feller's boundary classification for one-dimensional diffusions. Accessible boundary points (i.e. points which can be reached in finite time with positive probability) are divided into regular and exit points, whereas inaccessible points are divided into entrance and natural points. Since we are interested in conditioning on non-hitting zero, only the case 0 accessible needs to be considered (everywhere but in Section 4 where we look at a killed diffusion with 0 a natural boundary point) since otherwise the conditioneing would be redundant. The Yaglom limit in the regular case,

first discussed in [CMSM95] (a gap in the arguments was pointed out in [SE07]), was completely solved in [KS12]. Hence, we only discuss the singular case, i.e. we assume 0 to be an exit boundary.

The boundary at infinity is generally assumed to be inaccessible, which is a rather natural assumption as far as biological applications (see [CCL$^+$09]) are concerned.

As already observed in [CMSM95] for 0 being regular and ∞ being natural, it is crucial if certain absorption in the following sense holds or not.

Definition 1.4. *We say that absorption is certain if* $\mathbb{P}^x(T_0 < \infty) = 1$ *for any starting point* $x \in (0, \infty)$.

Equivalently, certain absorption can be reformulated by finiteness of the speed measure quantifying the minimum strength of the drift towards zero to obtain certain absorption

$$\mathbb{P}^x(T_0 < \infty) < 1 \text{ if and only if } \int_1^\infty \rho(s)^{-1}\, ds < \infty.$$

The cases in which absorption is not certain are simple since one can show that for $a > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}^\nu(X_t \in [0, a), T_0 > t)$$

decreases to 0 as $t \to \infty$ which then, combined with the boundedness from below of $\mathbb{P}^\nu(T_0 > t)$, implies that

$$P^\nu(X_t \in A \mid T_0 > t) = \frac{\mathbb{P}^\nu(X_t \in A, T_0 > t)}{\mathbb{P}^\nu(T_0 > t)}$$

converges to zero as $t \to \infty$. This implies that if absoption is not certain, $(X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ escapes to infinity.

To get around uncertain absorption, one might condition on the event of eventual absorption and apply our main results to the h-transformed process which has similar properties. This is discussed in Remark 3.6.

For the case of ∞ being a natural boundary, we need a regularity condition on the semigroup generated by the diffusion.

Assumption 1.5. *Let* $z \in (0, \infty)$ *and* $t > 0$. *Then*

$$e^{-tL}\mathbf{1}_{[0,z]} \in L^2((0, \infty), \rho)$$

and

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} e^{-tL}\mathbf{1}_{[\varepsilon,z]} = e^{-tL}\mathbf{1}_{[0,z]}$$

in $L^2((0, \infty), \rho)$.

To understand Assumption 1.5 better, we give sufficient conditions on the drift b in Section 2.3. The next result tells us under what conditions, when ∞ is a natural boundary point, we have convergence of $(X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ to a quasistationary distribution.

Theorem 1.6. *If* 0 *is an exit boundary,* ∞ *is a natural boundary point and Assumption 1.5 is true then*

- *If absorption is not certain and* $\lambda_0 > 0$, *then* $(X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ *escapes to infinity exponentially fast.*
- *If absorption is certain and* $\lambda_0 > 0$, *then* $(X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ *converges to a quasistationary distribution. This quasistationary distribution is unique for all compactly supported initial distributions.*

We do not claim that Assumption 1.5 is necessary. We plan to investigate this further in future work.

In the proof of Theorem of 1.6 we show that if absorption is not certain, then $\mathbb{P}^\nu(X_t \in [0,a) \mid T_0 > t)$ decays at least exponentially fast with rate λ_0. When 0 is regular and ∞ natural this was proven in Theorem 4 of [MSM01].

Theorem 1.6 immediately implies the following Corrollary

Corollary 1.7. *If* 0 *is an exit boundary,* ∞ *is a natural boundary, Assumption 1.5 is fulfilled and absorption is certain, then there exists a quasistationary distribution if and only if the bottom* λ_0 *of the spectrum of* l *is strictly positive.*

If 0 *is an exit boundary,* ∞ *is a natural boundary, absorption is not certain and* $\lambda_0 > 0$ *then there are no quasistationary distributions.*

Intuitively, convergence to a quasistationary distribution should become easier for entrance boundaries at ∞ since this implies there is a strong drift towards 0. Hence, escape to infinity gets more difficult and convergence to a quasistationary distribution more likely. The next theorem shows that this is true even in the absence of Assumption 1.5.

Theorem 1.8. *If* 0 *is an exit boundary and* ∞ *is an entrance boundary, then* $\lambda_0 > 0$ *and* $(X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ *converges to a quasistationary distribution.*

Note that we do not have to distinguish between certain and uncertain absorption. For ∞ being an entrance boundary, absorption at 0 is certain. In [CCL$^+$09], the authors have shown that $(X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ converges to a quasistationary distribution under a set of assumptions which ensure that the spectrum of L is discrete and that the lowest eigenfunction is integrable. The fact that this is always true is new and completes the picture. Furthermore, combined with their Theorem 7.3, we obtain a complete picture for ∞ being an entrance boundary and 0 an exit boundary.

Corollary 1.9. *If* 0 *is an exit boundary, then* ∞ *is entrance if and only if there is precisely one quasistationary distribution* $\bar{\nu}$*, Furthermore,* ν *attracts all initial distributions* ν*, i.e.*

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \mathbb{P}^\nu(X_t \in \cdot \mid T_0 > t) = \bar{\nu}(\cdot).$$

Remark 1.10. *Theorem 1.8 first appeared in the second author's PhD thesis. The same result was independently shown by Littin in* [Lit12]*. We include this result as it follows in a rather straightforward way given the general spectral theoretic tools developed in this work and previous ideas from* [CCL$^+$09] *and* [KS12]*. This makes this paper self-contained and all known results can be deduced from the ones presented in this paper.*

We would like to emphasize that the main contribution of this work consists in the derivation of weak general conditions which ensure the existence of the Yaglom limit for the case of two singular boundary points. In particular this work seems to be the first, which proves quasi-stationary convergence for an exit boundary at 0 *and rather general behaviour at* ∞ *allowing rather arbitrary continuous spectral types.*

Our strategy is similar to the one from [KS12] but in contrast to [KS12], where the authors could rely on analytic results available in the literature, it is necessary to develop a good deal of results concerning the spectral representation of L caused by the singularity at 0. The main problem is the fact that the cone of positive λ_0-harmonic functions might be two-dimensional. We have to choose a proper λ_0-harmonic function. Our analytic consideration will dictate the choice and finally allow us to characterize the existence of quasistationary distributions.

In Section 4 we show how a diffusion with 0 natural and ∞ entrance can come up as a natural biological model. In this model, the population evolves according to a stochastic version of a Lotka-Volterra equation with internal killing. The killing is chosen to be large when the population is small and small when the population is large. One possible biological interpretation is that when the population is small there is a higher chance of having a catastrophic event resulting in extinction. For this system we study the existence and uniqueness of quasistationary distributions. The killed diffusion does not fall into any previously studied frameworks because both of the boundary points are inaccessible. By studying the spectral properties of the generator of the killed diffusion we are able to prove that there exists a quasistationary distribution which attracts all compactly supported probability measures on $(0, \infty)$.

Theorem 1.11. *Suppose Z is a diffusion living on $\mathbb{R}$ with generator*

$$-\mathcal{L} := \frac{1}{2}\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + b(\cdot)\frac{d}{dx} = \frac{1}{2\rho(\cdot)}\frac{d}{dx}\rho(\cdot)\frac{d}{dx}$$

where,

$$\rho = \exp\left(\int_{-\infty}^{x} 2b(s)\,ds\right)$$

is the density of the speed measure of Z. Assume furthermore that $-\infty$ is a natural boundary, ∞ is an entrance boundary and that $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \rho\,dx < \infty$. Suppose Z^κ is the diffusion with generator

$$-\mathcal{L}_\kappa := \frac{1}{2}\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + b(\cdot)\frac{d}{dx} - \kappa(\cdot),$$

and that the killing rate κ satisfies

$$\lim_{x\to-\infty} q(x) = -\infty$$

where

$$q(x) := -\kappa(x) - \frac{1}{2}(|b(x)|^2 - b'(x)).$$

Then the process $(Z^\kappa_t)_{t\geq 0}$ has a quasistationary distribution π. Moreover, the quasistationary distribution π is a Yaglom limit and attracts all compactly supported probability measures on $\mathbb{R}$.

1.2. **Comparison with existing results.** We briefly discuss how our results are related to the existing literature.

We we were partly inspired by [CCL$^+$09] - this is one of the few papers which allows 0 to be a singular boundary. One of the aims of [CCL$^+$09] was to understand the existence and uniqueness of quasistationary distributions for the generalized Feller's diffusion $(Z_t)_{t\geq 0}$ that is given by (1.3). Under several technical assumptions (ensuring in particular the discreteness of the spectrum) the authors of [CCL$^+$09] proved the existence of quasistationary distributions for singular drift functions as well as uniqueness in the case when ∞ is an entrance boundary. We prove existence results similar to the ones from Section 5 of [CCL$^+$09] under much weaker assumptions. The most important progress of our work consists in the fact that our assumptions do not imply the discreteness of the spectrum of L. In Section 3.1.3, we discuss sufficient conditions for our Assumption 1.5 to be satisfied.

In particular, Proposition 3.8 shows that Assumption 1.5 is satisfied if a strict subset of the assumptions of [CCL$^+$09] is fulfilled. We are able to remove assumptions on the behaviour of the drift near ∞. In the particular case of interest from [CCL$^+$09], the generalized Feller's diffusion, the existence of a Yaglom limit for $(Z_t)_{t\geq 0}$ is equivalent

to the existence of a Yaglom limit for solutions of $(X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ of the transformed stochastic differential equation (1.4). As a result, it suffices to understand the simpler operator

$$L^h = -\frac{1}{2}\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + b^h(\cdot)\frac{d}{dx}, \tag{1.5}$$

where the drift has the form $b^h(x) = \frac{1}{2x} - \frac{2h(\gamma x^2/4)}{\gamma x}$. This motivated the study of convergence to a quasistationary distribution of general perturbed Bessel processes of the type

$$\tilde{L}^h = -\frac{1}{2}\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + \frac{a}{x}\frac{d}{dx} + c(x)\frac{d}{dx}$$

discussed in Remark 4.6 of [CCL$^+$09]. For their assumptions to be fulfilled one has to assume conditions on the drift near ∞ and near 0. In Proposition 3.8 (see also Remark 3.9) we show that our conditions concerning the behaviour of the drift near 0 are weaker than the corresponding one in [CCL$^+$09]. Moreover, the conditions we impose on the behaviour of the drift are much weaker than the corresponding ones in [CCL$^+$09]. This can already be seen from the fact that our conditions do not imply the discreteness of the spectrum of L while those from [CCL$^+$09] do.

For some recent work on quasistationary distributions with 0 exit or regular and ∞ entrance we refer the reader to [CV15b] and [CV15a]. Their approach is based on probabilistic and coupling methods while ours is based on spectral theory.

1.3. **One-dimensional diffusions on the half-line.** In the following we specify our setting. We will use the following notation

(1) $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ is the set of smooth functions on $\mathbb{R}$ with compact support.
(2) $L^p((0,\infty),\rho) := \left\{f : (0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R},\ \int_0^\infty |f(x)|^p\,\rho(dx) < \infty\right\}$.
(3) If L is a selfadjoint operator then we denote by $\sigma(L)$ its spectrum and by $(E_L(\lambda))_{\lambda\in\mathbb{R}}$ its spectral resolution.
(4) $\langle f, g\rangle_{L^2((0,\infty),\rho)} := \int_0^\infty fg\rho(dx)$ is the inner product on the Hilbert space $L^2((0,\infty),\rho)$.

Suppose $b : (0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous function. Consider the quadratic form q, defined as the closure of the map

$$C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}) \ni \phi \mapsto \frac{1}{2}\int_0^\infty |\phi'(x)|\,\rho(dx),$$

where $\rho(dx) = \rho(x)\,dx = e^{-2\int_1^x 2b(s)\,ds}\,dx$. It is easy to see that q is a Dirichlet form. The generator of this Dirichlet form is given by the unique selfadjoint extension associated to the form q in $L^2((0,\infty),\rho)$. This selfadjoint realization of the formal differential operator

$$\tau = -\frac{1}{2}\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + b(x)\frac{d}{dx}$$

will be denoted by L. We define e^{-tL} using spectral calculus via

$$e^{-tL}g = \int_{\sigma(L)} e^{-t\lambda}E_L(d\lambda)g,\ \ g \in L^2((0,\infty),\rho).$$

By Stone's formula the spectral resolution of L can be calculated from the resolvent $(L-z)^{-1}, z \in \mathbb{C}$ via

$$\begin{aligned}&\langle f, E_L((\lambda_1,\lambda_2])g\rangle_{L^2((0,\infty),\rho)}\\ &= \lim_{\delta\to 0+}\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0+}\int_{\lambda_1+\delta}^{\lambda_2+\delta} d\lambda\,\left\langle f, \left[(L-(\lambda+i\varepsilon))^{-1} - (L-(\lambda-i\varepsilon))^{-1}\right]g\right\rangle_{L^2((0,\infty),\rho)}.\end{aligned}$$

Let $\lambda_0 := \inf \sigma(L)$ denote the bottom of the spectrum of L. From the general theory of symmetric Markov semigroups we know that e^{-tL} generates a consistent family of strongly continuous semigroups on $L^p((0,\infty),\rho), 1 \leq p < \infty$. Moreover, there exists a continuous transition function

$$(0,\infty)^3 \ni (t,x,y) \mapsto p(t,x,y) \in (0,\infty)$$

which is symmetric in x and y, such that for all $f \in L^p((0,\infty),\rho)$ the semigroup can be represented as

$$e^{-tL} f(x) = \int_0^\infty p(t,x,y) f(y) \rho(dy).$$

The general theory of Dirichlet forms (see for example [FOT10]) implies there is a ρ-symmetric Hunt process $(X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ with continuous paths such that for every positive starting point and every $f \in C_c^\infty((0,\infty))$ the process

$$\left(f(X_t) - f(X_0) - \int_0^t Lf(X_s)\, ds \right)$$

is a martingale (up to some explosion time) with respect to the canonical filtration of $(X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ with quadratic variation $\int_0^t |f'(X_s)|^2\, ds$. Moreover, a stochastic representation of the semigroup is given by

$$e^{-tL} f(x) = \mathbb{E}^x \left[f(X_t), T_\infty \wedge T_0 > t \right]$$

for $f \in C_c^\infty((0,\infty))$ and T_∞ denoting the explosion time. Later on we will assume that ∞ is inaccessible, in which case $\mathbb{P}^x(T_\infty = \infty) = 1$. The reader, who is not familiar with the theory of Dirichlet forms should assume that b is locally Lipschitz and should think of the process $(X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ as the solution to the stochastic differential equation

$$dX_t = b(X_t)dt - dB_t.$$

We only consider the case where in the Feller classification of boundary points 0 is an *exit* point which is characterized by

$$\int_1^0 \left(\int_1^t \rho(s) ds \right) \rho(t)^{-1} dt < \infty \text{ and } \int_1^0 \left(\int_1^t \rho(s)^{-1} ds \right) \rho(t) dt = \infty. \tag{1.6}$$

We mainly look at the case when ∞ is *inaccessible* which means

$$\int_1^0 \left(\int_1^t \rho(s) ds \right) \rho(t)^{-1} dt = \infty.$$

Condition (1.6) implies that $\int_0^1 \rho(t)\, dt = \infty$ and $\int_0^1 \rho(t)^{-1}\, dt < \infty$. Furthermore, if ∞ is inaccessible it is called *natural* if

$$\int_1^0 \left(\int_1^t \rho(s)^{-1} ds \right) \rho(t) dt = \infty$$

and *entrance* if

$$\int_1^0 \left(\int_1^t \rho(s)^{-1} ds \right) \rho(t) dt < \infty.$$

For any $y \in (0,\infty)$ let

$$T_y := \inf\{t \geq 0 : X_t = y\}$$

be the first hitting time of y.

If ∞ is natural one has

$$\lim_{x\to\infty} \mathbb{P}^x(T_y < t) = 0, y \in (0,\infty), t > 0$$

whereas if ∞ is entrance one has

$$\lim_{x\to\infty} \mathbb{P}^x(T_y < t) > 0, y \in (0,\infty), t > 0.$$

Note that in the latter case there is a more hands-on equivalent formulation in terms of the drift function (see Remark 7.4 of [CCL$^+$09]): If $b(x)$ goes to infinity and $b'(x) > 0$ for $x > x_0$ for some $x_0 > 0$, then ∞ being an entrance boundary is equivalent to $\int_1^\infty \frac{1}{b(x)}\,dx < \infty$.

Remark 1.12. *If* 0 *is exit and* ∞ *is inaccessible the differential expression* τ *is in the limit point case at* 0 *and at* ∞*, i.e. the restriction of* L *to* $C_c^\infty(0,\infty)$ *is even essentially selfadjoint and hence has a unique selfadjoint extension. The fact that we are in the limit point case at* ∞ *can be found in* [KS12] *while the analogous statement for* 0 *is proved in* [Wie85].

1.4. **Outline.** The paper is organized as follows. We divide the arguments into two parts separating the analytic and the probabilistic results. In Section 2 we are going to discuss the analytic problems. The spectral decomposition for singular one-dimensional diffusions is explored – for ∞ entrance the spectrum is analyzed in more detail. Section 3 is dedicated to the probabilistic results regarding Yaglom limits. In Section 3.2 we apply our results to perturbations of generalized Bessel processes and in Section 3.4 to a diffusion from population dynamics.

Section 4 is about the study of a class of diffusions with internal killing for which 0 is natural and ∞ is entrance.

2. Analytic results

In this section we develop the spectral theory for the differential expression

$$\tau = -\frac{1}{2}\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + b(x)\frac{d}{dx}$$

with b having a singularity at 0. If there is no singularity at 0 this has already been done in [Man61], [SE07] and [KS12]. In [GZ06] the spectral theory was carried out for Schrödinger operators with strongly singular potential V, i.e.

$$-\frac{1}{2}\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + V(x)$$

where V is not locally integrable at 0. The straightforward approach to reduce the case of drift to the case of a potential by exploiting the unitary equivalence of τ to

$$-\frac{1}{2}\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + [b^2 - b'](x)$$

was carried out in [CCL$^+$09]. The disadvantage was that additional assumptions were needed on $b^2 - b'$

$$C = -\inf_{y\in(0,\infty)}(b(y)^2 - b'(y)) < \infty \text{ and } \lim_{y\to\infty}(b(y)^2 - b'(y)) = \infty.$$

We circumvent these additional assumptions on the behaviour of b close to 0 and ∞ by doing the spectral theory directly.

We start by proving a spectral theorem for diffusions with exit boundary at zero (Theorem 2.4) and then show that if, in addition, ∞ is an entrance boundary then the spectrum is discrete.

2.1. **Spectral Theorem for diffusion operators with singularity at** 0**.** We prove some results in order to show that one can transfer the results of Section 3 of [GZ06] to diffusions with singular drift (instead of a singular potential).

Definition 2.1. *A solution* $\tilde{\varphi}$ *of*

$$(\tau\psi)(z,x) = z\psi(z,x) \tag{2.1}$$

is called an analytic Weyl-Titchmarsh solution in $B_R := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < R\}$*, if* $\tilde{\varphi}$ *satisfies the following conditions*

i) *For every fixed* $z \in B_R$*,* $\tilde{\varphi}(z,\cdot)$ *is a non-trivial solution to* (2.1) *and for every fixed* $x \in (0,\infty)$ *the function* $\tilde{\varphi}(\cdot,x)$ *is analytic in* B_R*.*
ii) *If* $(z,x) \in (-R,R) \times (0,\infty)$ *then* $\tilde{\phi}(z,x) \in \mathbb{R}$*.*
iii) *For every* $a \in (0,\infty)$ *and* $z \in B_R$ *one has*

$$\int_0^a |\tilde{\varphi}(z,x)|^2 \rho(dx) < \infty.$$

The system of fundamental solutions of (2.1) is given by functions $\varphi(z,\cdot,x_0)$ and $\theta(z,\cdot,x_0)$ solving

$$\begin{aligned}(\tau\varphi)(z,x) &= z\varphi(z,x),\\ \varphi(z,x_0,x_0) &= \rho(x_0)\theta'(z,x_0,x_0) = 0,\\ \rho(x_0)\varphi'(z,x_0,x_0) &= \theta(z,x_0,x_0) = 1,\end{aligned}$$

for $z \in \mathbb{C}$ and a fixed reference point $x_0 \in (0,\infty)$. For every fixed $x \in (0,\infty)$ the solutions $\varphi(z,x,x_0)$ and $\theta(z,x,x_0)$ are analytic with respect to $z \in \mathbb{C}$ and satisfy

$$W(\theta(z,\cdot,x_0),\varphi(z,\cdot,x_0))(x) = 1,$$

where $W(f,g) = f(x)\rho(x)g'(x) - \rho(x)f'(x)g(x)$ denotes the Wronskian of f and g.

Later we will use the fact that for any fixed $x \in (0,\infty)$ the function $\tilde{\varphi}(z,x)$ is analytic in $z \in B_R$. For this observe that

$$\tilde{\varphi}(z,x) = \bar{\varphi}(z,x) := \tilde{\varphi}(z,x_0)\rho(x_0)\varphi(z,x,x_0) + \tilde{\varphi}(z,x_0)\theta(z,x,x_0),$$

as both sides of the above equation are solutions of $\tau u = zu$ satisfying $\tilde{\varphi}(z,x_0) = \bar{\varphi}(z,x_0)$ and $\rho(x_0)\tilde{\varphi}(z,x_0) = \rho(x_0)\bar{\varphi}(z,x_0)$. Differentiating both sides of the last equation shows the required analyticity of $\tilde{\varphi}(z,x)$ in $z \in B_R$.

We next introduce the Weyl-Titchmarsh solutions $\psi_\pm(z,\cdot,x_0)$, $x_0 \in (0,\infty)$, $z \in \mathbb{C}\setminus\mathbb{R}$, of (2.1). As argued in Remark 1.12 we are in the limit-point case at 0 and at ∞. This implies that the Weyl-Titchmarsh solutions are up to constant multiples characterized by

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_-(z,\cdot,x_0) &\in L^2((0,x_0),\rho),\\ \psi_+(z,\cdot,x_0) &\in L^2((x_0,\infty),\rho)\end{aligned}$$

for $z \in \mathbb{C}\setminus\mathbb{R}$. We normalize $\psi_\pm(z,\cdot,x_0)$ by requiring

$$\psi_\pm(z,x_0,x_0) = 1.$$

This yields

$$\psi_\pm(z,x,x_0) = \theta(z,x,x_0) + m_\pm(z,x_0)\varphi(z,x,x_0),\ x,x_0 \in (0,\infty), z \in \mathbb{C}\setminus\mathbb{R}$$

where $m_\pm(z,x_0)$ is defined by

$$m_\pm(z,x) = \frac{\rho(x)\psi'_\pm(z,x,x_0)}{\psi_\pm(z,x,x_0)}.$$

It is well-known that $m_\pm(z,x)$ are Herglotz- and anti-Herglotz-functions (see [Man61] for more properties of Herglotz functions), respectively.

Lemma 2.2. *Assume that there exists a Weyl-Titchmarsh solution $\tilde{\varphi}(z,x)$ to 2.1 that is analytic in B_R. Then there exists a solution $\tilde{\theta}(z,x)$ of (2.1) having the following conditions*

1. *For every $x \in (0,\infty)$ the function $\tilde{\theta}(\cdot,x)$ is analytic in $z \in B_R$.*
2. *For every $x \in (0,\infty), z \in \mathbb{R}$ one has $\tilde{\theta}(z,x) \in \mathbb{R}$.*
3. *For every $x \in (0,\infty), z \in B_R$*

$$W(\tilde{\theta}(z,\cdot),\tilde{\varphi}(z,\cdot)) \equiv 1.$$

Proof. We follow the proof of Lemma 3.3 from [Man61]. Fix $x_0 \in (0,\infty)$ and consider

$$\tilde{\theta}(z,x) = \frac{\rho(x_0)\tilde{\varphi}'(z,x_0)}{\tilde{\varphi}(z,x_0)^2 + (\rho(x_0)\tilde{\varphi}'(z,x_0))^2}\theta(z,x,x_0) - \frac{\tilde{\varphi}'(z,x_0)}{\tilde{\varphi}(z,x_0)^2 + (\rho(x_0)\tilde{\varphi}'(z,x_0))^2}\varphi(z,x,x_0)$$

Since the solution $\tilde{\varphi}(z,\cdot)$ is non-trivial for every $z \in B_R$ we have $\tilde{\varphi}(z,x_0) \neq 0$ and $\rho(x_0)\tilde{\varphi}'(z,x_0) \neq 0$ for every $z \in B_R$. Thus we conclude that $\tilde{\theta}(z,\cdot)$ is well defined for $z \in B_R$. Due to the properties of $\tilde{\varphi}(z,x_0), \theta(z,x,x_0)$ and $\varphi(z,x,x_0)$ the function $\tilde{\theta}(z,\cdot)$ is analytic in $z \in B_R$ for every fixed $x \in (0,\infty)$. Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned} W(\tilde{\theta}(z,\cdot),\tilde{\varphi}(z,\cdot))(x) &= W(\tilde{\theta}(z,\cdot),\tilde{\varphi}(z,\cdot))(x_0) \\ &= \tilde{\theta}(z,x_0)\rho(x_0)\tilde{\varphi}'(z,x_0) - \rho(x_0)\tilde{\theta}'(z,x_0)\tilde{\varphi}(z,x_0) \\ &= \frac{(\rho(x_0)\tilde{\varphi}'(z,x_0))^2}{\tilde{\varphi}(z,x_0)^2 + (\rho(x_0)\tilde{\varphi}'(z,x_0))^2} + \frac{(\tilde{\varphi}'(z,x_0))^2}{\tilde{\varphi}(z,x_0)^2 + (\rho(x_0)\tilde{\varphi}'(z,x_0))^2} \\ &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

□

Let $\tilde{m}_+(z)$ be such that

$$\tilde{\psi}_+(z,x) = \tilde{\theta}(z,x) + \tilde{m}_+(z)\tilde{\varphi}(z,x),\ x \in (0,\infty)$$

is a solution to (2.1) that satisfies for all $a \in (0,\infty), z \in B_R \setminus \mathbb{R}$

$$\tilde{\psi}_+(z,\cdot) \in L^2((a,\infty),\rho).$$

Since the differential expression is in the limit point case at infinity the solution $\tilde{\psi}_+(z,\cdot)$ is proportional to $\psi_+(z,\cdot,x_0)$. This gives

$$m_+(z,x) = \frac{\rho(x)\tilde{\theta}'(z,x) + \tilde{m}_+(z)\rho(x)\tilde{\varphi}(z,x)}{\tilde{\theta}(z,x) + \tilde{m}_+(z)\tilde{\varphi}(z,x)}$$

and by direct computation

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{m}_+(z) &= \frac{m_+(z,x)\tilde{\theta}(z,x) - \rho(x)\tilde{\theta}'(z,x)}{\rho(x)\tilde{\varphi}(z,x) - m_+(z,x)\tilde{\varphi}(z,x)} = \frac{W(\tilde{\varphi}(z,\cdot),\psi_+(z,\cdot,x_0))}{W(\tilde{\varphi}(z,\cdot),\psi_+(z,\cdot,x_0))} \\ &= \frac{\tilde{\theta}(z,x)}{\tilde{\varphi}(z,x)}\frac{m_+(z,x)}{m_-(z,x) - m_+(z,x)} - \frac{\rho(x)\tilde{\theta}'(z,x)}{\tilde{\varphi}(z,x)}\frac{1}{m_-(z,x) - m_+(z,x)} \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

Since m_- and m_+ are Herglotz- and anti-Herglotz functions respectively, $\tilde{\varphi}(x,z)$ and $\tilde{\theta}(z,x)$ are analytic, and since $\tilde{\varphi}(z,x \neq 0$ we see that $\tilde{m}_+(z)$ is analytic in $z \in B_R$. Note that $\tilde{\varphi}(z,x)$ is not 0, since if there would be an x_0 with $\tilde{\varphi}(z,x_0) = 0$, then the function $\tilde{\varphi}(z,\cdot)$ would be an eigenfunction to a non-real eigenvalue of the selfadjoint realization of τ in $L^2((0,x_0),\rho)$ with Dirichlet boundary condition at x_0.

A direct computation for $z \in B_R \setminus \sigma(L)$ and $x, y \in (0,\infty)$ shows that the Green's function $G(z,x,y)$ is given by

$$G(z,x,y) = \begin{cases} \tilde{\varphi}(z,x)\tilde{\psi}_+(z,y) & \text{if } 0 < x \leq y, \\ \tilde{\varphi}(z,y)\tilde{\psi}_+(z,x) & \text{if } 0 < y \leq x. \end{cases} \tag{2.3}$$

This means that for every $x \in (0,\infty)$ and $f \in L^2((0,\infty),\rho)$

$$((L-z)^{-1}f)(x) = \int_0^\infty G(z,x,y)f(y)\rho(dy). \tag{2.4}$$

The next lemma collects some important properties of $\tilde{m}_+$. These will be crucial for the spectral decomposition that is carried out in the next theorem.

Lemma 2.3. *Assume that there exists an analytic Weyl-Titchmarsh solution of 2.1 in B_R. Then the function $\tilde{m}_+$ satisgies the following conditions:*

i) $\tilde{m}_+(z) = \overline{\tilde{m}_+(\bar{z})}$ *for* $z \in B_R$,
ii) *For any* $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ *and* $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$ *there exists a constant* $C(\lambda_1,\lambda_2,\epsilon_0)$ *such that* $\varepsilon|\tilde{m}_+(\lambda+i\varepsilon)| \leq C(\lambda_1,\lambda_2,\epsilon_0)$ *for all* $\lambda \in [\lambda_1,\lambda_2], 0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$,
iii) *For any* $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ *and* $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$ *one has* $\varepsilon|Re\,(\varepsilon|\tilde{m}_+(\lambda+i\varepsilon))\,| = o(1)$ *for all* $\lambda \in [\lambda_1,\lambda_2], 0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$,
iv) *The limit*
$$\lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0}(i\varepsilon)\tilde{m}_+(\lambda+i\varepsilon) = \lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0}\varepsilon Im(\tilde{m}_+(\lambda+i\varepsilon))$$
exists for all $\lambda \in (-R,R)$ *and is nonnegative,*
v) *For a.e.* $\lambda \in [\lambda_1,\lambda_2]$ *one has*
$$\tilde{m}_+(\lambda+i0) = \lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0}\tilde{m}_+(\lambda+i\varepsilon)$$
and $Im(\tilde{m}_+(\lambda+i0)) \geq 0$.

Moreover, there exists a measure σ such that

$$\sigma((\lambda_1,\lambda_2]) = \lim_{\delta\downarrow 0}\lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0}\frac{1}{\pi}\int_{\lambda_1+\delta}^{\lambda_2+\delta} Im(\tilde{m}_+(\lambda+i\varepsilon))d\lambda. \tag{2.5}$$

Proof. Since for $(\lambda,x) \in (-R,R)\times(0,\infty)$ the numbers $\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda,x)$ and $\tilde{\theta}(\lambda,x)$ are real, we get for $(z,x) \in B_R \times (0,\infty)$

$$\tilde{\varphi}(z,x) = \overline{\tilde{\varphi}(\bar{z},x)}\ ,\ \tilde{\theta}(z,x) = \overline{\tilde{\theta}(\bar{z},x)}.$$

Let $c,d \in (0,\infty)$ with $c < d$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\sigma(L)} \frac{d\|E_L(\lambda)\mathbb{1}_{[c,d]}\|^2_{L^2((0,\infty),\rho)}}{\lambda - z} &= \left\langle \mathbb{1}_{[c,d]}, (L-z)^{-1}\mathbb{1}_{[c,d]} \right\rangle_{L^2((0,\infty),\rho)} \\ &= \int_c^d \rho(dx)\int_c^x \rho(dy)\tilde{\theta}(z,x)\tilde{\varphi}(z,y) \\ &\quad + \int_c^d \rho(dx)\int_x^d \rho(dy)\tilde{\theta}(z,y)\tilde{\varphi}(z,x) \\ &\quad + \tilde{m}_+(z)\left[\int_c^d \rho(dx)\tilde{\varphi}(z,x)\right]^2. \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

Observe that we can find c,d in such a way that

$$\int_c^d \tilde{\varphi}(z,x)\rho(dx) \neq 0$$

for all z in a sufficiently small complex open neighborhood of $[\lambda_1, \lambda_2]$. Note that equation (2.6) implies i). Define the function H via

$$\mathbb{C} \setminus \sigma(L) \ni z \mapsto \int_{\sigma(L)} \frac{d\|E_L(\lambda)\mathbb{1}_{[c,d]}\|^2_{L^2((0,\infty),\rho)}}{\lambda - z}.$$

Then H is a Herglotz function and ii)-iv) follow from the basic properties of $\tilde{\theta}(z,x)$ and $\tilde{\varphi}(z,x)$. By the Herglotz property of H we also have

$$\lim_{\delta\downarrow 0}\lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0}\frac{1}{\pi}\int_{\lambda_1+\delta}^{\lambda_2+\delta}\mathrm{Im}\int_{\sigma(L)}\frac{d\|E_L(\lambda)\mathbb{1}_{[c,d]}\|^2_{L^2((0,\infty),\rho)}}{\lambda-(x+i\varepsilon)}\,dx = \|E_L((\lambda_1,\lambda_2])\mathbb{1}_{[c,d]}\|^2_{L^2((0,\infty),\rho)}$$

We next apply (2.6) to $\lambda + i\varepsilon$ with $\lambda \in (\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough. Then the quantity σ from (2.5) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma((\lambda_1,\lambda_2]) &= \lim_{\delta\downarrow 0}\lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0}\frac{1}{\pi}\int_{\lambda_1+\delta}^{\lambda_2+\delta}\mathrm{Im}(\tilde{m}_+(\lambda+i\varepsilon))d\lambda \\
&= \lim_{\delta\downarrow 0}\lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0}\frac{1}{\pi}\int_{\lambda_1+\delta}^{\lambda_2+\delta}d\lambda\mathrm{Im}\Bigg\{\int_{\sigma(L)}\frac{d\|E_L(\tilde{\lambda})\mathbb{1}_{[c,d]}\|^2_{L^2((0,\infty),\rho)}}{\tilde{\lambda}-(\lambda+i\varepsilon)} \\
&\quad\times\left[\left(\int_{c_0}^{d_0}\rho(dx)\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda,x)\right)^2 + 2i\varepsilon\left(\int_{c_0}^{d_0}\rho(dx)(d/dz)\tilde{\varphi}(z,x)\Big|_{z=\lambda}\right) + O(\varepsilon^2)\right]^{-1} + O(\varepsilon)\Bigg\} \\
&= \int_{(\lambda_1,\lambda_2]} d\|E_L(\lambda)\mathbb{1}_{[c,d]}\|^2_{L^2((0,\infty),\rho)}\left[\int_{c_0}^{d_0}\rho(dx)\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda,x)\right]^{-2}
\end{aligned}$$

and therefore defines a measure on $\mathbb{R}$. □

Part iv) of the following theorem connects the measure σ from Lemma 2.3 with the spectral measure of the operator L.

Theorem 2.4. *Assume that 0 is an exit boundary. Then the following hold:*

i) *For every $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ the ordinary differential equation $(\tau-\lambda)u = 0$ has a fundamental system $(u^1_\lambda, u^2_\lambda)$ of solutions with*

$$\lim_{x\to 0} u^1_\lambda(x) = 0 \text{ and } \lim_{x\to 0} u^2_\lambda(x) = 0.$$

Furthermore, $u^1_\lambda \in L^1((0,\infty),\rho) \cap L^2((0,\infty),\rho)$ is satisfied.

ii) *For every fixed $R > 0$ there exists a Weyl-Titchmarsh solution $\tilde{\varphi}(z,x)$ for L, that is analytic in B_R.*

iii) *Let $R > 0$ and $\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda,\cdot)$ be as in ii). If $\lambda_0 = \inf spec(L)$, then $\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda_0,\cdot)$ is non-negative.*

iv) *Let $R > 0$ and $\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda,\cdot)$ be as in ii). There is a measure $\sigma = \sigma_R$ on $\mathbb{R}$, such that for every $F \in C(R)$, every $f, g \in C_c^\infty((0,\infty))$, and every $-R < \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < R$*

$$\langle f, F(L)E_L((\lambda_1,\lambda)2])g\rangle_{L^2((0,\infty),\rho)} = \left\langle \hat{f}, M_{F\mathbb{1}_{(\lambda_1,\lambda_2]}}\hat{g}\right\rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{R},\sigma)},$$

where

$$\hat{h}(\lambda) := \int_0^\infty \tilde{\varphi}(\lambda,x)h(x)\rho(dx)$$

for $h \in C_c^\infty((0,\infty))$ and $M_{F\mathbb{1}_{(\lambda_1,\lambda_2]}}$ denotes the bounded operator, which acts by multiplication with the function $F\mathbb{1}_{(\lambda_1,\lambda_2)}$.

v) *Let $R > 0$ and $\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda, \cdot)$ be as in ii). Then*

$$E([\lambda_0, \lambda_1])e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_A(x) = \int_A h^{\lambda_1}(t, x, y)\, dy,$$

where

$$h^{\lambda_1}(t, x, y) := \int_{\lambda_0}^{\lambda_1} e^{-t\lambda}\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda, x)\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda, y)\sigma(d\lambda).$$

Proof. We first construct the fundamental system for part i). We have to show that there exists an anayltic Weyl-Titchmarsh function $\tilde{\varphi}(z, \cdot), z \in B_R$. For $z \in B_R$ we construct a solution $u^R(z, x)$ of the equation $(L - z)u = 0$ in a certain neighborhood U of 0, which for every fixed $x \in U$ is analytic in $z \in B_R$ and which for every fixed $z \in B_R$ satisfies $\lim_{x\to 0} u^R(z, x) = 1$. Since the ordinary differential equation $(L - z)u = 0$ is linear each $u^R(z, \cdot), z \in B_R$ gives rise to a solution of $(L - z)u = 0$ not only on U but also on $(0, \infty)$. As a result it is enough to construct $u^R(z, \cdot)$ only on U. This will be done by a well-known iteration procedure.

For $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ choose $\delta = \delta_R > 0$ such that for every $z \in B_R$ and $x \in (0, \delta)$

$$\int_0^x \rho(r)^{-1}\, dr \int_r^\delta \rho(s)\, ds < \varepsilon.$$

Set $u_0^R(z, x) = 1$ and recursively define

$$u_{n+1}^R(z, x) = 1 + z\int_0^x \rho(r)^{-1}\, dr \int_r^\delta u_n^R(z, s)\rho(s)\, ds.$$

One can then easily see by induction that the sequence $(u_n^R(z, x))_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges uniformly for $x \in [0, \delta_R], z \in B_R$. This implies that the limit

$$u^R(z, x) := \lim_{n\to\infty} u_n^R(z, x)$$

is continuous for every $x \in [0, \delta_R]$ and for every fixed x is analytic in $z \in B_R$. Moreover the limit satisfies

$$u^R(z, x) = 1 + z\int_0^x \rho(r)^{-1}\, dr \int_r^\delta u^R(z, s)\rho(s)\, ds$$

and solves for every $z \in B_R$ the equation $(L-z)u = 0$ in $(0, \delta_R)$ with $\lim_{x\to 0} u^R(z, x) = 1$. One also has that for $\lambda \in \mathbb{R} \cap B_R$ the quantity $u^R(\lambda, x)$ is real.

Choose $\tilde{\delta}_R$ such that $u^R(z, x) \neq 0$ for every $(z, x) \in B_R \times (0, \tilde{\delta}_R)$ and set for every $x \in (0, \tilde{\delta}_R)$

$$\tilde{\varphi}^R(z, x) := u^R(z, x)\int_0^x u^R(z, y)^{-2}\rho(y)^{-1}dy.$$

Observe that $\tilde{\varphi}^R(\lambda, x) \in \mathbb{R}$ for real λ and that $\lim_{x\to 0} \tilde{\varphi}^R(z, x) = 0$. For any simple closed path γ in B_R due to the analyticity of $u^R(z, x)$ in $z \in B_R$

$$\int_\gamma \left(\int_0^x u^R(z, s)^{-2}\rho(s)^{-1}\, ds\right) dz = \int_0^x \left(\int_\gamma u^R(z, s)^{-2}\rho(s)^{-1}\, dz\right) ds = 0$$

so by Morera's theorem we see that $\tilde{\varphi}^R(z, x)$ is analytic in $z \in B_R$. The two solutions $u^R(z, \cdot)$ and $vp^R(z, \cdot)$ are linearly independent and the solution $\tilde{\varphi}(z, \cdot)$ is also integrable since

$$\left|\int_0^x \tilde{\varphi}^R(z, t)\, dt\right| \leq \frac{\max_{y\in[0,x]} |u^R(z, y)|}{(\min_{y\in[0,x]} |u^R(z, y)|)^2}\int_0^x \rho(t)\int_0^t \rho(s)^{-1} < \infty$$

and 0 is an exit boundary. It remains to observat that $\tilde{\varphi}^R(z,\cdot) \in L^\infty((0,1),\rho)$. Since bounded and integrable functions are square integrable we get that for every $z \in B_R$ and $a \in (0,\infty)$

$$\int_0^a |\tilde{\varphi}^R(z,x)|^2 \rho(dx) < \infty.$$

For parti iv) we modify the techniques from [Man61]. We make use of Stone's formula in order to connect σ with the spectral resolution E_L of L. Stone's formula implies that

$$\langle f, F(L)E_L((\lambda_1,\lambda_2])g,\rangle_{L^2((0,\infty),\rho)} = \lim_{\delta\downarrow 0}\lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0}\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\lambda_1+\delta}^{\lambda_2+\delta} d\lambda F(\lambda)\Big[\langle f,(L-(\lambda+i\varepsilon))^{-1}g\rangle_{L^2((0,\infty),\rho)} - \langle f,(L-(\lambda-i\varepsilon))^{-1}g\rangle_{L^2((0,\infty),\rho)}\Big].$$

Using formula (2.4) for the kernel of the resolvent we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle f, F(L)E_L((\lambda_1,\lambda_2])g)_{L^2((0,\infty),\rho)}\\
&= \lim_{\delta\downarrow 0}\lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0}\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\lambda_1+\delta}^{\lambda_2+\delta} d\lambda F(\lambda)\Bigg\{\int_0^\infty \rho(dx)\Bigg[\overline{f(x)}\tilde{\psi}_+(\lambda+i\varepsilon,x)\int_0^x \tilde{\varphi}(\lambda+i\varepsilon,y)g(y)\rho(dy)\\
&+\overline{f(x)}\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda+i\varepsilon,x)\int_x^\infty \rho(dy)\tilde{\psi}_+(\lambda+i\varepsilon,y)g(y)\Bigg] - \Bigg[\overline{f(x)}\tilde{\psi}_+(\lambda-i\varepsilon,x)\int_0^x \rho(dy)\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda-i\varepsilon,y)g(y)\\
&+\overline{f(x)}\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda-i\varepsilon,x)\int_x^\infty \rho(dy)\tilde{\psi}_+(\lambda-i\varepsilon,y)g(y)\Bigg]\Bigg\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since all integrals are on bounded sets and since the integrands are continuous we can interchange integrals and limits to get

(2.7)
$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle f, F(L)E_L((\lambda_1,\lambda_2])g)_{L^2((0,\infty),\rho)}\\
&= \int_0^\infty \rho(dx)\overline{f(x)}\Bigg\{\int_0^x \rho(dy)g(y)\lim_{\delta\downarrow 0}\lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0}\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\lambda_1+\delta}^{\lambda_2+\delta} d\lambda F(\lambda)[\tilde{\psi}_+(\lambda+i\varepsilon,x)\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda+i\varepsilon,y)\\
&-\tilde{\psi}_+(\lambda-i\varepsilon,x)\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda-i\varepsilon,y)]\\
&+\int_0^\infty \rho(dy)g(y)\lim_{\delta\downarrow 0}\lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0}\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\lambda_1+\delta}^{\lambda_2+\delta} d\lambda F(\lambda)[\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda+i\varepsilon,x)\tilde{\psi}_+(\lambda+i\varepsilon,y)\\
&-\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda-i\varepsilon,x)\tilde{\psi}_+(\lambda-i\varepsilon,y)]\Bigg\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Due to the regularity properties of $\tilde{\varphi}$ and $\tilde{\theta}$ we have that as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\theta}(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) &= \tilde{\theta}(\lambda,x) \pm i\varepsilon\frac{d}{dz}\tilde{\theta}(z,x)\Big|_{z=\lambda} + O(\varepsilon^2),\\
\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) &= \tilde{\varphi}(\lambda,x) \pm i\varepsilon\frac{d}{dz}\tilde{\varphi}(z,x)\Big|_{z=\lambda} + O(\varepsilon^2)
\end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

where $O(\varepsilon)$ is locally uniform in (λ,x). Therefore we get by (2.8) and by ii) of Lemma 2.3

$$\begin{aligned}
&\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda+i\varepsilon,x)\tilde{\psi}_+(\lambda+i\varepsilon,y) - \tilde{\varphi}(\lambda-i\varepsilon)\tilde{\psi}_+(\lambda-i\varepsilon,y)\\
&= \tilde{\varphi}(\lambda,x)[\tilde{\theta}(\lambda,y)+\tilde{m}_+(\lambda-i\varepsilon)\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda,y)] + \tilde{\varphi}[\tilde{\theta}(\lambda,y)+\tilde{m}_+(\lambda-i\varepsilon)\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda,y)] + o(1),
\end{aligned}$$

where $o(1)$ is locally uniform. The previous equation together with (2.7) gives

$$\begin{aligned}&\langle f, F(L)E_L((\lambda_1,\lambda_2])g)_{L^2((0,\infty),\rho)}\\&= \int_0^\infty \rho(dx)\overline{f(x)}\int_0^\infty \rho(dy)g(y)\lim_{\delta\downarrow 0}\lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0}\frac{1}{\pi}\int_{\lambda_1+\delta}^{\lambda_2+\delta} d\lambda F(\lambda)\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda,y)\mathrm{Im}(\tilde{m}_+(\lambda+i\varepsilon)).\end{aligned}$$

By the definition of the measure σ we have for every $h \in C(\mathbb{R})$

$$\int_{(\lambda_1,\lambda_2]} h(\lambda)\sigma(d\lambda) = \lim_{\delta\downarrow 0}\lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0}\frac{1}{\pi}\int_{\lambda_1+\delta}^{\lambda_2+\delta} d\lambda \mathrm{Im}(\tilde{m}_+(\lambda+i\varepsilon))h(\lambda)$$

which yields

$$\begin{aligned}&\langle f, F(L)E_L((\lambda_1,\lambda_2])g)_{L^2((0,\infty),\rho)}\\&= \int_0^\infty \rho(dx)\overline{f(x)}\int_0^\infty \rho(dy)g(y)\int_{(\lambda_1,\lambda_2]}\sigma(d\lambda)F(\lambda)\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda,x)\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda,y).\end{aligned}$$

Part v) follows directly from iv) by taking a mollifier at x for f and a smoothing procedure for $g = \mathbb{1}_A$.

Finally, part iii) can be shown exactly as in the case of a regular boundary at 0, see for example [KS12]. □

Remark 2.5. *Observe that for different $0 < R_1 < R_2$ the solutions $\tilde{\varphi}^{R_1}(\lambda,\cdot)$ and $\tilde{\varphi}^{R_2}(\lambda,\cdot)$ with $\lambda \in (0, R_1)$ are linearly dependent and thus can only differ by a constant factor C_λ*

$$\tilde{\varphi}^{R_2}(\lambda,\cdot) = C_\lambda\tilde{\varphi}^{R_1}(\lambda,\cdot).$$

This implies that quotients of expressions involving $\tilde{\varphi}^R$ are well defined and independent of R. In particular measures of the form

$$\mu^R_{(0,z)}(B) = \frac{\int_B \tilde{\varphi}^R(\lambda_0,x)\rho(dx)}{\int_0^z \tilde{\varphi}^R(\lambda_0,x)\rho(dx)}$$

with $z \in (0,\infty]$ and B a Borel subset of $(0,\infty)$ are independent of R. In such a situation we omit the dependence of $\tilde{\varphi}^R$ on R.

2.2. **Spectral Theorem for entrance boundary at ∞.** We now consider the case when ∞ is an entrance boundary in more detail. It turns out that this simplifies things. In [CCL+09] it was shown that when ∞ is an entrance boundary and 0 is not singular the spectrum of L is discrete. We show how this result can be lifted to a singularity at 0 by splitting b into the singular part close to 0 and a regular part away from 0.

The following theorem gives us in particular an improved version of Theorem 2.4 v). It tells us that the probability $\mathbb{P}^x(X_t \in A, T_0 > t) = e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_A(x)$ can be represented globally by the eigenfunctions of L.

Theorem 2.6. *Assume that 0 is an exit boundary and ∞ is entrance. Then the spectrum of L is purely discrete, consisting of countably many eigenvalues $\lambda_0 < \lambda_1 < \dots$, and the eigenfunctions (u_{λ_k}) belong to $L^1((0,\infty),\rho)$. In particular, we obtain the representation*

$$e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_A(x) = \int_A p(t,x,y)\,dy$$

with

$$p(t,x,y) = \sum_{k\geq 0} e^{-t\lambda_k}u_{\lambda_k}(x)u_{\lambda_k}(y),$$

where the series converges in $L^2((0,\infty),\rho)$. Moreover, one has

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} e^{\lambda_0 t} p(t,x,y) = u_{\lambda_0}(x) u_{\lambda_0}(y)$$

where the convergence is locally uniform in $(x,y) \in (0,\infty)\times(0,\infty)$.

Remark 2.7. *As already pointed out in Remark 1.10 Theorem 2.6 is shown in a similar but slightly different way in* [Lit12]. *In order to make our paper independent and thus also useful as a basic reference for subsequent works we include its proof here.*

Proof. Let us first introduce the splitting by defining the operators L_a and L^a associated to the closure of the quadratic forms q_a

$$C_c^\infty((0,\infty)) \ni f \mapsto q_a(f) = \frac{1}{2}\int_a^\infty |f'(t)|^2 \rho(dt)$$

and q^a

$$C_c^\infty((0,\infty)) \ni f \mapsto q^a(f) = \frac{1}{2}\int_0^a |f'(t)|^2 \rho(dt)$$

It was shown in [CCL$^+$09] that for every $a \in (0,\infty)$ the spectrum of L_a is discrete (note that by the continuity of b the boundary a is regular). Due to the decomposition principle (see section 131 in [AG54]) it is thus enough to prove that the spectrum of the remaining operator L^a is discrete at 0. This will be done by using a well-known result of Hartmann (see e.g. Theorem 1.1 in [Wei67]), which says that the essential spectrum is empty if for every $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ every solution of the equation $(\tau-\lambda)u = 0$ has only finitely many zeroes in $(0,a)$.

We argue by contradiction. Assume that $\lambda > 0$ and that v is a nontrivial solution of $(\tau-\lambda)u = 0$ and that v has infinitely many zeroes in $(0,a)$. Observe that no x_0 with $v(x_0) = 0$ is a local extremum since v is assumed to be nontrivial solution. Between two successive zeroes there is necessarily a local extremum. As $\lambda > 0$ and v satisfies $\tau v = \lambda v$, local maxima of v are necessarily positive and local minima negative. As a result we can pick two sequences $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $(\tilde{x}_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that

(1) For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$x_n < \tilde{x}_n,$$

(2)

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} x_n = 0,$$

(3) For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ v is non-increasing on $(x_n, \tilde{x}_n)$ and $v(x_n) > 0$.

This implies that

$$0 < v(x_n) = \int_{x_n}^{\tilde{x}_n} \rho(s)^{-1}\, ds \int_{x_n}^{s} \rho(t) 2\lambda v(t) dt \le 2\lambda v(x_n) \int_{x_n}^{\tilde{x}_n} \rho(s)^{-1}\, ds \int_{x_n}^{s} \rho(s)\, dt$$

and therefore

$$\frac{1}{2\lambda} \le \int_{x_n}^{\tilde{x}_n} \rho(s)^{-1}\, ds \int_{x_n}^{s} \rho(s)\, dt. \tag{2.9}$$

Since 0 is an exit boundary we must have $\int_1^0 \rho(s)^{-1}\, ds \int_1^s \rho(t)\, dt < \infty$, equation (2.9) cannot be true. Thus every solution of the eigenvalue equation $(\tau-\lambda)u = 0$ has only a finite number of zeroes in $(0,a)$.

It remains to prove the integrability of the eigenfunction v_{λ_0} corresponding to the lowest eigenvalue λ_0. First observe that $\lim_{x\to 0} v_{\lambda_0}(x) = 0$. This follows from the

fact that by the definition of L there exists a sequence $(\varphi_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset C_c^\infty((0,\infty))$ which converges to v_{λ_0} with respect to the norm

$$\mathcal{D}(q) \ni f \mapsto \left(\|f\|^2_{L^2((0,\infty),\rho)} + \int_0^\infty |f'(x)|^2 \rho(dx) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

The elementary inequality

$$\sup_{x\in[0,a]} |\varphi(x)| \leq C_a \left(\int_0^\infty |\varphi'(x)|^2 \rho(dx) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

implies that for $a \in (0,\infty)$, $\|\varphi_n - \varphi_m\|_{C([0,a))} \to 0$ as $n, m \to \infty$ and therefore $\lim_{x\to 0} v_{\lambda_0}(x) = 0$.

By Theorem 2.4 there exists a solutions u_{λ_0} and $\tilde{u}_{\lambda_0}$ of the equation $(\tau - \lambda_0)u = 0$ with the following properties

(1) $\lim_{x\to 0} u_{\lambda_0}(x) = 1$,
(2) $\lim_{x\to 0} \tilde{u}_{\lambda_0}(x) = 0$ and $\tilde{u}_{\lambda_0} \in L^1((0,a),\rho)$ for all $a \in (0,\infty)$,
(3) $(u_{\lambda_0}, \tilde{u}_{\lambda_0})$ forms a basis for the space of solutions of $(\tau - \lambda_0)u = 0$.

We conclude that $v_{\lambda_0} \in L^1((0,a),\rho)$. Since ∞ is entrance we also have $\int_1^\infty \rho(dy) < \infty$ which implies

$$v_{\lambda_0} \in L^1((1,\infty),\rho) \subset L^2((0,\infty),\rho).$$

Note that we used that v_{λ_0} is an L^2-eigenfunction. Summing everything up, we have shown that $v_{\lambda_0} \in L^1((0,\infty),\rho)$.

Since we have proved that the spectrum is discrete and that the eigenfunctions are integrable, the spectral representation of $p(t,x,y)$ now follows directly from the spectral theorem. The last assertion of the theorem can be proved exactly as in [Sim93]. □

2.3. **Positivity Criterion for the Spectrum.** The main results are based on the positivity of the spectrum of L, that is $\lambda_0 > 0$. Because this criterion is not very hands-on we include a criterion that is only in terms of the drift b. For a regular boundary at 0 the following criterion was proved in [Pin09] (also see [Muc72] for a closely related result). To adjust it to our singular setting we use, just like in previous proofs, a splitting (or decomposition) method.

Proposition 2.8. *Assume that 0 is an exit boundary and that absorption is certain. The bottom of the spectrum λ_0 is strictly positive if and only if for some $a \in (0,\infty)$*

$$A(b,a) := \sup_{x>a} \left(\int_a^x \rho(y)^{-1}\, dy \right) \left(\int_x^\infty \rho(y)\, dy \right) < \infty$$

In particular the strict positivity of λ_0 implies $\int_1^\infty \rho(y)\, dy < \infty$.

Proof. If λ_0 is an isolated eigenvalue, then we have $\lambda_0 > 0$. This follows from the transience of L and general criticality theory (see section 5.1 in [Pin95]). A simple proof of the assertion that 0 cannot be an isolated eigenvalue adapted to our setting uses exactly the same strategy as in assertion vi) of [CCL$^+$09]. Therefore $\lambda_0 = 0$ if and only if $\lambda_0 = \sigma_{ess}(L) = 0$ and it remains to prove that the bottom of the essential spectrum of L is positive if and only if $A(b,a) < \infty$ for some $a \in (0,\infty)$.

Observe that by the decomposition principle (see section 131 in [AG54] and the proof of Theorem 2.6 the essential spectrums of the operators L and L_a coincide. Note that due

to our assumptions the boundary point a is regular for the L_a-diffusion and absorption at a is certain for the L_a-diffusion. In [Pin09] it is shown that

$$\frac{1}{8A(b,a)} \leq \inf \sigma(L_a) \leq \frac{1}{2A(b,a)}$$

Thus, if $A(b,a) < \infty$ for some $a \in (0,\infty)$, then $\sigma_{ess} \geq \inf \sigma(L_a) > 0$. On the other hand if $A(b,a) = \infty$ for some $a \in (0,\infty)$, then we have $0 = \inf \sigma_{ess}(L_a) = \inf \sigma_{ess}(L) \geq \inf \sigma(L)$. □

Of course, if one does not assume that absorption is certain it might happen that $\lambda_0 > 0$ and $\int_1^\infty \rho(y)\, dy = \infty$. We will see that in such a situation mass escapes towards infinity with an exponential rate given by λ_0

3. Yaglom Limits

This section is dedicated to proofs of the main existence results. We make use heavily of the machinery developed in Section 2. The section is structured according to the boundary classification at ∞. We start with ∞ being a natural boundary and then consider entrance and exit boundaries.

3.1. Natural boundary at ∞.

For a natural boundary at ∞ the main strategy is as follows: First, we prove that a local form of convergence to a quasistationary distribution holds by restricting to compact sets which, in the notation of Steinsaltz/Evans [SE07], is called convergence to a quasistationary distribution on compacta. In a second step, we prove that either (non-local) convergence to a quasistationary distribution or escape to infinity occurs.

3.1.1. *Convergence on Compacta.* We show how one can use spectral calculus to derive convergence to the quasistationary distribution $\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda_,\cdot)$ for compact sets.

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose that* 0 *is an exit boundary,* ∞ *is natural and Assumption 1.5 holds. If* $A \subset B$ *are compact subsets of* $[0,\infty)$ *and* ν *is a compactly supported initial distribution on* $(0,\infty)$*, then*

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \mathbb{P}^\nu(X_t \in A \mid X_t \in B) = \frac{\int_A \tilde{\varphi}(\lambda_0,x)\rho(dx)}{\int_B \tilde{\varphi}(\lambda_0,x)\rho(dx)},$$

where $\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda_0,\cdot)$ *is the generalized eigenfunction from Definition 2.1*

We first present a sketch of how to use the general form of the spectral theorem (Theorem 2.4) to find the Yaglom limit. First, to get from probability to spectral analysis note that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}^x(X_t \in A \mid X_t \in B) &= \frac{\mathbb{P}^x(X_t \in A)}{\mathbb{P}^x(X_t \in B)} = \frac{e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_A(x)}{e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_B(x)} \\ &= \frac{E[[\lambda_0,\lambda_1]]e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_A(x) + E[(\lambda_1,\infty)]e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_A(x)}{E[[\lambda_0,\lambda_1]]e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_B(x) + E[(\lambda_1,\infty)]e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_B(x)}\end{aligned}$$

To make the latter rigourous we need to impose Assumption 1.5 as $\mathbb{1}_A$ does not need to be square integrable with respect to $\rho(x)$. To show that the right hand side of the last equation converges to

$$\frac{\int_A \tilde{\varphi}(\lambda_0,x)\,\rho(dx)}{\int_B \tilde{\varphi}(\lambda_0,x)\,\rho(dx)},$$

we show that the part determined by the spectrum away from its bottom λ_0 is neglectable, i.e. $E[(\lambda_1)]e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_B(x)$ and $E[(\lambda_1)]e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_A(x)$ converge to zero fast enough. The spectral part at the bottom determines the limit, as we show that

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\frac{E([\lambda_0,\lambda_1])e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_A(x)}{E([\lambda_0,\lambda_1])e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_B(x)}=\frac{\int_A\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda_0,x)\,\rho(dx)}{\int_B\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda_0,x)\,\rho(dx)}. \tag{3.1}$$

In this step the spectral theorem plays a significant role as by Theorem 2.4 v) one has

$$E([\lambda_0,\lambda_1])e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_A(x)=\int_{\lambda_0}^{\lambda_1}e^{-t\lambda}\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda,x)\int_A\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda,y)\rho(dy)\sigma(d\lambda).$$

As we have some intuition for what the correct limit is we now carry on the rigorous proof.

Proof. First note that the generalized eigenfunctions of L exist due to Theorem 2.4 . We first show that for $z>0$ and subsets $A,B\subset(0,z]$ with $A\subset B$ we have

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\mathbb{P}^\nu(X_t\in A\mid X_t\in B)=\frac{\int_A\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda_0,x)\rho(dx)}{\int_B\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda_0,x)\rho(dx)},$$

as sketched above. This can be done as in [CCL$^+$09] (see also [SE07]) with some additional work to avoid the problem that $\mathbb{1}_A$ does not necessarily belong to $L^2((0,\infty),\rho)$, which causes the problem that e^{-tL} as an operator in L^2 cannot be applied to the functions $\mathbb{1}_A$ and $\mathbb{1}_B$. Assumption 1.5 will be used to circumvent this problem.

For a subset $A\subset[0,z]$ and $\varepsilon>0$ define the set $A_\varepsilon:=\{x\in A:|x|>\varepsilon\}$. By Assumption 1.5, $\lim_{\varepsilon\to0}e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_{A_\varepsilon}=e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_A$ in $L^2((0,\infty),\rho)$ for any $t>0$. This allows us to decompose $e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_A$ as

$$e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_A(x)=E([\lambda_0,\lambda_1])e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_A(x)+E((\lambda_1,\infty))e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_A(x)$$

in L^2 and hence for almost every $x\in(0,\infty)$ which by continuity extends to every $x\in(0,\infty)$. Observe moreover that as sketched above, Theorem 2.4 iv) yields for $\lambda_1\in(0,\infty)$ that the continuous integral kernel $h^{\lambda_1}(t,x,y)$ of the operator $E((\lambda_0,\lambda_1))e^{-tL}$ is given by

$$h^{\lambda_1}(t,x,y)=\int_{[\lambda_0,\lambda_1]}e^{-t\lambda}\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda,x)\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda,y)\sigma(d\lambda).$$

We will sometimes simplify notation and write $\langle,\rangle$ instead of $\langle,\rangle_{L^2((0,\infty),\rho)}$.

If ν is an initial distribution with compact support in $(0,\infty)$, then due to the continuity of the functions $e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_A, E([\lambda_0,\lambda_1])e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_A$, and $E((\lambda_1,\infty))e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_A$ the expressions

$$\langle e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_A,\nu\rangle,\ \langle E([\lambda_0,\lambda_1])e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_A,\nu\rangle \text{ and } \langle E((\lambda_1,\infty))e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_A,\nu\rangle$$

are well-defined and we get

$$\langle e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_A,\nu\rangle=\langle E([\lambda_0,\lambda_1])e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_A,\nu\rangle+\langle E((\lambda_1,\infty))e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_A,\nu\rangle$$

Using Fubini's theorem we see that

$$\begin{aligned}\langle E([\lambda_0,\lambda_1])e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_A(\cdot),\nu\rangle&=\left\langle\int_0^\infty h^{\lambda_1}(t,\cdot,y)\mathbb{1}_A\rho(dy),\nu\right\rangle\\&=\int_0^\infty\int_{[\lambda_0,\lambda_1]}e^{-\lambda t}\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda,x)\int_A\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda,y)\rho(dy)\sigma(d\lambda)\nu(dx)\\&=\int_{[\lambda_0,\lambda_1]}e^{-\lambda t}\int_0^\infty\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda,x)\nu(dx)\int_A\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda,y)\rho(dy)\sigma(d\lambda).\end{aligned}$$

The use of Fubini's theorem can be justified by using the properties of the generalized eigenfunctions $\tilde{\varphi}$. Now observe that, just as in the regular case (see [SE07] and [CCL$^+$09])

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \frac{\left\langle E([\lambda_0,\lambda_1])e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_A,\nu\right\rangle}{\left\langle E([\lambda_0,\lambda_1])e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_{[0,z]},\nu\right\rangle} = \frac{\int_A \tilde{\varphi}(\lambda_0,x)\rho(dx)}{\int_0^z \tilde{\varphi}(\lambda_0,x)\rho(dx)} \tag{3.2}$$

We are left to show that the remainder terms corresponding to the spectrum away from its bottom are neglectable, i.e.

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \mathbb{P}^\nu(X_t \in A \mid X_t \le z) = \lim_{t\to\infty} \frac{\left\langle E([\lambda_0,\lambda_1])e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_A,\nu\right\rangle}{\left\langle E([\lambda_0,\lambda_1])e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_{[0,z]},\nu\right\rangle}.$$

We use ideas that are similar to the ones used in the case of a regular boundary at 0. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\mathbb{P}^\nu(X_t\in A)}{\langle E([\lambda_0,\lambda_1])e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_A,\nu\rangle} &= \frac{\langle E([\lambda_0,\lambda_1])e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_A,\nu\rangle + \langle E((\lambda_1,\infty))e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_A,\nu\rangle}{\langle E([\lambda_0,\lambda_1])e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_A,\nu\rangle}\\ &= 1 + \frac{\langle E((\lambda_1,\infty))e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_A,\nu\rangle}{\langle E([\lambda_0,\lambda_1])e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_A,\nu\rangle}\end{aligned}$$

Using $e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_A \in L^2((0,\infty),\rho)$ and the elementary inequality

$$|g(x)| \le \left(\int_0^x \rho(x)^{-1}dx\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\int_0^\infty |g'(x)|^2\rho(dx)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}},\ g\in\mathcal{D}(\sqrt{L})$$

yields

$$\begin{aligned}\langle E((\lambda_1,\infty))e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_A,\nu\rangle &\le C_\nu\left(\int_0^\infty |g_t'(x)|^2\rho(dx)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\\ &= \left(\int_{\lambda_1}^\infty e^{-2(t-\varepsilon)\lambda}\|E(d\lambda)e^{-\varepsilon L}\mathbb{1}_A\|_{L^2((0,\infty),\rho)}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\end{aligned}$$

where $g_t : E((\lambda_1,\infty))e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_A$ and $\varepsilon>0$ is small enough. As a result the map

$$t\mapsto \langle E((\lambda_1,\infty))e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_A,\nu\rangle$$

decays exponentially with an exponential rate which is strictly larger than the exponential rate of decat of

$$t\mapsto \langle E([\lambda_0,\lambda_1])e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_A,\nu\rangle$$

We can now finish the proof noting that

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{t\to\infty}\mathbb{P}^\nu(X_t\in A\mid X_t\in B) &= \lim_{t\to\infty}\frac{\mathbb{P}^\nu(X_t\in A)}{\mathbb{P}^\nu(X_t\in B)}\\ &= \lim_{t\to\infty}\frac{E[[\lambda_0,\lambda_1]]e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_A(x)+E[(\lambda_1,\infty)]e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_A(x)}{E[[\lambda_0,\lambda_1]]e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_B(x)+E[(\lambda_1,\infty)]e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_B(x)}\\ &= \lim_{t\to\infty}\frac{E[[\lambda_0,\lambda_1]]e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_A(x)}{E[[\lambda_0,\lambda_1]]e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_B(x)}\\ &= \frac{\int_A\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda_0,x)\rho(dx)}{\int_B\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda_0,x)\rho(dx)}.\end{aligned}$$

□

Having proved the existence of the Yaglom limit for compact sets A, we now have a good guess as to which quasistationary distribution is the correct limit. All we have to do is extend the reasoning from compact A to arbitrary A.

3.1.2. *Proof of the main theorem.* We now present an elegant argument, which in the case when 0 is regular, is due to Steinsaltz and Evans [SE07].

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose ∞ is a natural boundary point, the initial distribution ν is compactly supported, and $\lambda_0 > 0$. Then one of the following two properties holds*

i) $(X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ *converges to the quasistationary distribution* $\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda_0, \cdot)$.
ii) $(X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ *escapes to infinity.*

Proof. Let

$$f(z,t) := \frac{\mathbb{P}^\nu(X_t > z)}{\mathbb{P}^\nu(X_t \leq z)},$$

and note that

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} f(z,t) = \infty, z \geq 0 \iff (X_t)_{t\geq 0} \text{ escapes to infinity},$$

$$\lim_{z\to\infty}\lim_{t\to\infty} f(z,t) = 0, z \geq 0 \iff (X_t)_{t\geq 0} \text{ converges to the quasistationary distribution } \tilde{\varphi}(\lambda_0,\cdot).$$

In order to prove the dichotomoy one has to make sure that no other limits of f other than 0 and ∞ are possible. First note that for fixed $0 \leq a \leq z$

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathbb{P}^\nu(X_{n+1} > z) &= \mathbb{P}^\nu(X_{n+1} \geq a) - \mathbb{P}^\nu(a \leq X_{n+1} \leq z)\\ &\geq \mathbb{P}^\nu(X_{n+1} \geq a \mid X_n > z)\mathbb{P}^\nu(X_n > z) - \mathbb{P}^\nu(a \leq X_{n+1} \leq z)\\ &\geq \mathbb{P}^\nu(\forall t \in [0,1] : X_t \geq a)\mathbb{P}^\nu(X_n > z) - \mathbb{P}^\nu(a \leq X_{n+1} \leq z)\end{aligned}$$

where we used the strong Markov property. Due to ∞ being natural, $\mathbb{P}^\nu(\forall t \in [0,1] : X_t \geq a)$ converges to 1 as $z \to \infty$. Further, if we use the convergence to the quasistationary distribution $\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda_0, \cdot)$ on compacta from Theorem 3.1 we get

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\mathbb{P}^\nu(a \leq X_{n+1} \leq z)}{\mathbb{P}^\nu(X_{n+1} \leq z)} = \frac{\int_a^z \tilde{\varphi}(\lambda_0, x)\rho(dx)}{\int_0^z \tilde{\varphi}(\lambda_0, x)\rho(dx)} \leq \frac{\int_a^\infty \tilde{\varphi}(\lambda_0, x)\rho(dx)}{\int_0^z \tilde{\varphi}(\lambda_0, x)\rho(dx)}$$

For each $\varepsilon > 0$ we can find n', z_0, a such that for all $n \geq n'$ and $z \geq z_0$

$$\mathbb{P}^\nu(\forall t \in [0,1] : X_t \geq a) > 1 - \varepsilon$$

and

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}^\nu(a \leq X_{n+1} \leq z)}{\mathbb{P}^\nu(X_{n+1} \leq z)} < \varepsilon.$$

Since $\lambda_0 > 0$ we can find some n'' such that for $n \geq n''$ and $z \geq z_0$ and ε small enough

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}^\nu(X_n \leq z)}{\mathbb{P}^\nu(X_{n+1} \leq z)} \geq q > 1/(1-\varepsilon).$$

We get that if a, n, z are large enough then

$$\begin{aligned}f(z, n+1) &= \frac{\mathbb{P}^\nu(X_{n+1} > z)}{\mathbb{P}^\nu(X_{n+1} \leq z)}\\ &\geq \frac{\mathbb{P}^\nu(\forall t \in [0,1] : X_t \geq a)\mathbb{P}^\nu(X_n > z)}{\mathbb{P}^\nu(X_{n+1} \leq z)} - \frac{\mathbb{P}^\nu(a \leq X_{n+1} \leq z)}{\mathbb{P}^\nu(X_{n+1} \leq z)}\\ &\geq \mathbb{P}^\nu(\forall t \in [0,1] : X_t \geq a)\frac{\mathbb{P}^\nu(X_n > z)}{\mathbb{P}^\nu(X_n \leq z)}\frac{\mathbb{P}^\nu(X_n \leq z)}{\mathbb{P}^\nu(X_{n+1} \leq z)} - \frac{\mathbb{P}^\nu(a \leq X_{n+1} \leq z)}{\mathbb{P}^\nu(X_{n+1} \leq z)}\\ &\geq q(1-\varepsilon)f(z,n) - \varepsilon.\end{aligned}$$

Since ε is arbitrarily small, taking limits on both sides yields

- $\limsup_{n\to\infty} f(n,z) = \infty, \forall z \geq 0$; or
- $\lim_{z\to\infty} \limsup_{n\to\infty} f(n,z) = 0$.

We still have to extend the above to real times $t \geq 0$. First note that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{z\to\infty} \limsup_{t\to\infty} \frac{\mathbb{P}^\nu(X_t > z)}{\mathbb{P}^\nu(X_t \leq z)} \\
&= \lim_{z\to\infty} \limsup_{t\to\infty} \frac{\mathbb{P}^\nu(X_t > z)}{\mathbb{P}^\nu(X_n \leq z)} \frac{\mathbb{P}^\nu(X_n \leq z)}{\mathbb{P}^\nu(X_t \leq z)} \\
&\leq \lim_{z\to\infty} \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{\mathbb{P}^\nu(\exists t \in [n,n+1) : X_t > z)}{\mathbb{P}^\nu(X_n \leq z)} \sup_{t\in[n,n+1)} \frac{\mathbb{P}^\nu(X_n \leq z)}{\mathbb{P}^\nu(X_t \leq z)}.
\end{aligned}$$

We also have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}^\nu(\exists t \in [n,n+1) : X_t > z) \\
&= \mathbb{P}^\nu(\exists t \in [n,n+1) : X_t > z, X_n \geq z) + \mathbb{P}^\nu(\exists t \in [n,n+1) : X_t > z, X_n < z) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}^\nu(X_n \geq z) + \mathbb{P}^\nu(\exists t \in [n,n+1) : X_t > z \mid X_n < z)\mathbb{P}^\nu(X_n \leq z) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}^\nu(X_n \geq z) + \mathbb{P}^\nu(\exists t \in [n,n+1) : X_t > z \mid X_n < z).
\end{aligned}$$

The second summand tends to 0 due to the convergence to the quasistationary distribution $\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda_0, \cdot)$ on compacta.

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}^\nu(\exists t \in [n,n+1) : X_t > z \mid X_n < z) = \frac{\int_0^z \mathbb{P}^x(\exists t \in [0,1) : X_t > z \mid X_n < z)\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda_0, x)\rho(dx)}{\int_0^\infty \tilde{\varphi}(\lambda_0, x)\rho(dx)}.$$

Without loss of generality we may assume $\int_0^\infty \tilde{\varphi}(\lambda_0, x)\rho(dx) < \infty$ since otherwise $(X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ escapes to infinity. As a result, due to dominated convergence the limit in z can be taken inside and we get 0 since ∞ is inaccessible. We therefore get

$$\lim_{z\to\infty} \lim_{t\to\infty} \frac{\mathbb{P}^\nu(X_t > z)}{\mathbb{P}^\nu(X_t \leq z)} = 0.$$

The second case is similar. For any $a > z$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\liminf_{t\to\infty} f(z,t) \\
&\geq \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{\mathbb{P}^\nu(X_n > a) - \mathbb{P}^\nu(a < X_n, \exists t \in [n,n+1) : X_t \leq z)}{\mathbb{P}^\nu(X_n \leq a) + \mathbb{P}^\nu(a < X_n, \exists t \in [n,n+1) : X_t \leq z)} \\
&\geq \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{f(a,n)(1 - \mathbb{P}^\nu(\exists t \in [n,n+1) : X_t \leq z \mid a < X_n))}{1 + f(a,n)\mathbb{P}^\nu(\exists t \in [n,n+1) : X_t \leq z \mid a < X_n)} \\
&= \liminf_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}^\nu(\exists t \in [n,n+1) : X_t \leq z \mid a < X_n)^{-1} - 1
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is true since $\lim_{n\to\infty} f(a,n) = \infty$. Hence, the right hand side diverges as a tends to infinity since ∞ is natural. We thus showed that for all $z \geq 0$

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} f(z,t) = \infty.$$

□

Remark 3.3. *We highlight two important features of Lemma 3.2. First, we obtained a dichotomy of escape to infinity and convergence to a quasistationary distribution which, thus far, does not give any criterion which helps to decide. Second, the initial distribution ν is fixed, whereas the main theorems are formulated for arbitrary compactly supported initial conditions.*

As shown in the next proposition the important observation is that the dichotomy does lead to a precise criterion: true exponential decrease of survival probabilities, i.e.

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \mathbb{P}^\nu(T_0 > t) < 0$$

turns out to imply convergence to the quasistatioanry distribution $\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda_0, \cdot)$.

Proposition 3.4. *Suppose* 0 *is an exit boundary,* ∞ *is natural, absorption is certain,* ν *is a compactly supported initial distribution, and* $\lambda_0 > 0$*. Then*

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \mathbb{P}^\nu(T_0 > t) < 0$$

implies the convergence to the quasistationary distribution $\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda_0, \cdot)$*.*

Proof. It suffices to show that escape to infinity implies non-exponential decrease of the survival probability. This is true since then exponential decrease implies no escape to infinity which due to the dichotomy from Lemma 3.2 implies convergence to the quasistationary distribution $\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda_0, \cdot)$.

Note that escape to infinity implies the weak convergence of the measures $\mathbb{P}^\nu(X_t \in \cdot \mid T_0 > t)$ to δ_∞. We apply this result to $f(x) = \mathbb{P}^x(T_0 > t)$ (the continuity of f follows as in the proof of Lemma 7.2 of [CCL$^+$09]). Combined with the Chapman-Kolmogorov relation this yields

$$\mathbb{P}^\nu(T_0 > t + s \mid T_0 > t) = \lim_{s\to\infty} \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}^y(T_0 > t)\mathbb{P}^\nu(X_s \in dy \mid T_0 > s) = \lim_{y\to\infty} \mathbb{P}^y(T_0 > t).$$

The right hand side equals 1 since ∞ is a natural boundary point. Finally, since

$$\mathbb{P}^\nu(T_0 > t + s \mid T_0 > t) = \frac{\mathbb{P}^\nu(T_0 > t + s)}{\mathbb{P}^\nu(T_0 > s)}$$

the survival probabilities cannot decrease exponentially fast. □

We are now ready to prove our main result

Theorem 3.5. *If* 0 *is an exit boundary,* ∞ *is a natural boundary point and Assumption 1.5 is true then*

- *If absorption is not certain and* $\lambda_0 > 0$*, then* $(X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ *escapes to infinity exponentially fast.*
- *If absorption is certain and* $\lambda_0 > 0$*, then* $(X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ *converges to a quasistationary distribution. This quasistationary distribution is unique for all compactly supported initial distributions.*

In particular, Proposition 3.4 shows that in order to prove Theorem 3.5, it suffices to check that $\lambda_0 > 0$ implies the exponential decay of survival probabilities for some compactly supported initial distribution. This can be done using a martingale argument.

Proof. By Proposition 3.4 it is enough to show that for every initial distribution ν with compact support in $(0, \infty)$

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \mathbb{P}^\nu(T_0 > t) < 0.$$

The bottom of the spectrum of the operator $L - \lambda_0/2$ is $\lambda_0/2$ which implies that the operator $L - \lambda_0/2$ is subcritical or equivalently there exit two linearly independent positive solutions u_1, u_2 of the equation $(\tau - \lambda_0/2)u = 0$ (see for example Proposition 1.2 in [Pin95]). Thus, by assertion i) of Theorem 2.4 there exists a positive solution u of $(\tau - \lambda_0/2)u = 0$ with $\lim_{x\to 0+} u(x) = 1$.

Consider the stochastic process defined by $Y_t := e^{\frac{\lambda_0}{2}t\wedge T_0}u(X_{t\wedge T_0}), t \geq 0$. Using Ito's formula one sees that that $(Y_{t\wedge T_M})_{t\geq 0}$ is a martingale with respect to $\mathbb{P}^x$ for all $M > 0$. This forces for all $x \in (0,\infty)$

$$\mathbb{E}^x\left[e^{\frac{\lambda_0}{2}t\wedge T_0\wedge T_M}u(X_{t\wedge T_0\wedge T_M})\right] = u(x).$$

We let $M \to \infty$ and $t \to \infty$ and apply Fatou's lemma twice to get

$$\mathbb{E}^x\left[e^{\frac{\lambda_0}{2}T_0}\right] \leq u(x).$$

Now we integrate with respect to the initial distribution ν, use the exponential Markov inequality and the integrability of $e^{\frac{\lambda_0}{2}T_0}$ for all $x > 0$ to get that

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\frac{1}{t}\log\mathbb{P}^\nu(T_0 > t) \leq \lim_{t\to\infty}\frac{1}{t}\log\frac{\mathbb{E}^\nu\left[e^{\frac{\lambda_0}{2}T_0}\right]}{e^{\frac{\lambda_0}{2}t}} \leq -\frac{\lambda_0}{2}$$

which is strictly negative by assumption. Thus in the case of certain absorption the condition $\lambda_0 > 0$ implies the convergence to the Yaglom limit independently of the initial distribution ν.

We next show that if absorption is not certain, $(X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ escapes exponentially fast to infinity, that is, for all $a \in (0,\infty)$ and every compact subset $K \subset (0,\infty)$

$$\limsup_{t\to\infty}\sup_{x\in(0,a)} e^{\lambda_0 t}\mathbb{P}^x(X_t \in K \mid T_0 > t) < \infty.$$

Note, that as we mentioned before, for any fixed $a > 0$ there exists a constant $C_a > 0$ such that for all $f \in \mathcal{D}(q)$

$$\sup_{x\in(0,a)}|f(x)| \leq C_a\left(\int_0^\infty |f'(t)|^2\rho(dt)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

By spectral calculus we conclude that $e^{-tL}g \in \mathcal{D}(q)$ for every $g \in L^2((0,\infty),\rho)$ and therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{x\in(0,a)}\mathbb{P}^x(X_t \in K, T_0 > t) &= \sup_{x\in(0,a)}(e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_K)(x)\\ &\leq C_a\left(\int_0^\infty |(e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_K)'(x)|^2\rho(dt)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\\ &= C_a\left(\int_{\lambda_0}^\infty e^{-2t\lambda}d\|E_\lambda\mathbb{1}_K\|^2_{L^2((0,\infty),\rho)}\right)\end{aligned}$$

We obtain

$$\limsup_{t\to\infty}\sup_{x\in(0,a)} e^{\lambda_0 t}\mathbb{P}^x(X_t \in K, T_0 > t) \leq C_a\limsup_{t\to\infty}\left(\int_{\lambda_0}^\infty e^{2\lambda_0 t}e^{-2t\lambda}d\|E_\lambda\mathbb{1}_K\|^2_{L^2((0,\infty),\rho)}\right).$$

The right hand side is finite and even equal to 0 if λ_0 does not belong to the point spectrum of L. Since ν is compactly supported we have

$$\mathbb{P}^\nu(X_t \in K, T_0 > t) = \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}^x(X_t \in K, T_0 > t)\nu(dx)$$

which extends the exponential decay to the initial distribution ν. Finally, since $\mathbb{P}^\nu(T_0 > t)$ is bounded away from zero, we obtain the exponential decay of

$$\mathbb{P}^\nu(X_t \in K \mid T_0 > t) = \frac{\mathbb{P}^\nu(X_t \in K, T_0 > t)}{\mathbb{P}^\nu(T_0 > t)}$$

□

Remark 3.6. *We discuss how one can circumvent the assumption of certain absorption. Since* 0 *is an exit boundary,* $(X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ *hits zero in finite time with positive probability and we can condition on eventual absorption:*

$$\mathbb{P}^x(X_t \in \cdot \mid T_0) < \infty.$$

This way one includes the condition that absorption happens in finite time. We can then reduce this problem to ours by using a Doob h-transform. The function $h(x) = \mathbb{P}^x(T_0 < \infty)$ *is harmonic and by the general theory of h-transforms (see* [Pin95] *and Section 4.4 in* [CCL$^+$09]*) the process* $(X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ *conditioned to hit* 0 *corresponds to the generator* L^h *whose action is given by*

$$\tau^h f = \frac{1}{h}\tau(hf) = -\frac{1}{2}\frac{d^2}{dx^2}f + \left(b - \frac{h'}{h}\right)\frac{d}{dx}f.$$

The process associated to the operator L^h *can again be defined by Dirichlet form techniques. The associated measures on path space are given by the family* $(\mathbb{Q}^x)_{x\in(0,\infty)}$ *that is defined via*

$$\mathbb{Q}^x(\cdot) = \mathbb{P}^x(\cdot \mid T_0 < \infty).$$

The operator L^h *can be realized as a selfadjoint operator in the Hilbert space* $L^2((0,\infty, h(x)\rho(dx))$.

Since the spectrum is invariant under h-transforms, we conclude that the positivity of the bottom of the spectrum of L implies the positivity of the spectrum of L^h.

Note that conditioning on hitting 0 *implies that* 0 *is accessible and absorption is certain. Hence, if* 0 *is an exit boundary with respect to the measure* $\mathbb{Q}^x$ *we can apply our results (if* 0 *is regular use the results of* [KS12]*) in order to conclude that for every Borel set* $A \subset (0,\infty)$

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \mathbb{Q}^x(X_t \in A \mid T_0 > t) = \frac{\int_A \tilde{\varphi}^h(\lambda_0, x)h(x)\rho(dx)}{\int_0^\infty \tilde{\varphi}^h(\lambda_0, x)h(x)\rho(dx)}$$

where $\tilde{\varphi}^h(\lambda_0, x)$ *is the unique solution of* $(\tau^h - \lambda_0)u = 0$ *satisfying* $\int_0^a |u(x)|^2 h(x)\rho^h(dx) < \infty$ *for* $a \in (0,\infty)$*, where* ρ^h *is the speed measure for the drift* $b - \frac{h'}{h}$.

Remark 3.7. *We want to point out that our methods allow to include killing in the interior of* $(0,\infty)$. *Let* $\kappa : (0,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$ *be the killing rate and define the operator* τ_κ *via*

$$\tau_\kappa := -\frac{1}{2}\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + b(\cdot)\frac{d}{dx} + \kappa(\cdot).$$

This corresponds to a regular diffusion $(X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ *killed in the interior of* $(0,\infty)$ *using the rate* κ. *If U is a mean one exponential random variable that is independent of the diffusion X we define the killing time to be*

$$T_\kappa := \inf\left\{t > 0 : \int_0^t \kappa(X_s)\, ds > U\right\}.$$

and we set

$$T_\partial := \min(T_0, T_\kappa).$$

Then one can define the concepts of quasistationary distribution and Yaglom limit using the random time T_∂ instead of T_0 in Definitions 1.1 and 1.2.

Our process can in this case die due to the internal killing and not only due to the absorption at 0. It therefore makes sense to also look at the case when both 0 and ∞ are inaccessible (whereas until now we always wanted 0 to be accessible). In order to prove the analogues of our results with internal killing one has to follow the steps which have been worked out in detail in [KS12]. *See* [CV15a] *for when one has internal killing and 0 is exit or regular and ∞ is entrance.*

We present some results when 0 is natural and ∞ is entrance in Section 4.

3.1.3. *Sufficient Conditions for Assumption 1.5.* We next give some necessary conditions for Assumption 1.5, Unfortunately, these conditions are not minimal. A complete understanding of Assumption 1.5 remains open. Furthermore, it is very natural to conjecture that Assumption 1.5 is not necessary in the proof of Theorem 3.5.

Proposition 3.8. *Suppose that $b \in C^1((0,\infty))$, $\inf_{s>0}(b(s)^2 - b'(s)) > c$ for some $c > 0$ and*

$$\int_0^1 s\sqrt{\rho(s)}ds < \infty. \tag{3.3}$$

Then Assumption 1.5 holds.

Proof. We use several ideas from [CCL$^+$09]. First observe that it is enough to prove that $e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_{[0,\varepsilon]} \in L^2((0,\infty),\rho)$ for $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ as for every $0 < \varepsilon < z$ the function $\mathbb{1}_{(\varepsilon,z)}$ obviously belongs to $L^2(\rho)$. By Girsanov's theorem (see Proposition 2.2 of [CCL$^+$09]) and our assumptions we have

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_{[0,\varepsilon]}(x) &= \mathbb{E}^x\left[\mathbb{1}_{[0,\varepsilon]}(B_t)e^{\frac{1}{2}Q(x)-\frac{1}{2}Q(B_t)-\frac{1}{2}\int_0^t (b^2-b')(B_s)\,ds}, t < T_0\right] \\ &\le e^{-\frac{c}{2}t}e^{\frac{1}{2}Q(x)}\int_0^\varepsilon p^D(t,x,y)e^{-\frac{1}{2}Q(y)}dy, \end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

where $(B_t)_{t\ge 0}$ is a standard Brownian motion, $Q(x) := 2\int_1^x b(s)\,ds$ and $p^D(t,x,y)$ denotes the heat kernelt for the Laplacian on $(0,\infty)$ with Dirichlet boundary conditions at 0, i.e.

$$p^D(t,x,y) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi t}}\left(e^{\frac{(x-y)^2}{2t}} - e^{\frac{(x+y)^2}{2t}}\right) = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{\pi t}}e^{\frac{-x^2}{2t}}e^{\frac{-y^2}{2t}}\sinh\left(\frac{xy}{t}\right)$$

We obtain from (3.4) that

$$e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_{[0,\varepsilon]}(x) \le e^{-\frac{c}{2}t}e^{\frac{1}{2}Q(x)}\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{\pi t}}e^{\frac{-x^2}{2t}}e^{\frac{x}{t}}\int_0^\varepsilon ye^{-\frac{1}{2}Q(y)}\,dy, \tag{3.5}$$

where we used the convexity of sinh to get $\sinh(\frac{xy}{t}) \le y\sinh(\frac{x}{t}) \le \frac{y}{2}e^{\frac{x}{t}}$. Finally, equation (3.5) implies that $e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_{[0,\varepsilon]} \in L^2((0,\infty),\rho)$ as well as $\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\left\|e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_{[0,\varepsilon]}\right\|_{L^2((0,\infty),\rho)} = 0$. □

Remark 3.9. *Condition* (3.3) *is part of condition (H4) from* [CCL$^+$09] *and the condition $\inf_{s>0}(b(s)^2 - b'(s)) > c$ is one half of condition (H2) from* [CCL$^+$09]. *We want to point out that in addition to these assumptions on the behaviour of the drift near 0 the authors of* [CCL$^+$09] *also have to assume conditions concerning the behaviour of the drift near ∞ (see condition H2 in* [CCL$^+$09]*). Thus as far as the existence of quasistationary distributions and the existence of the Yaglom limits is concerned our conditions are weaker than the ones in* [CCL$^+$09].

Note that the assumption

$$\lim_{x\to\infty} b(x)^2 - b'(x) = \infty$$

from [CCL$^+$09] *ensures the discreteness of the spectrum of L and thus rules out some interesting examples, where the rate of convergence to quasistationarity is not geometric. Also, contrary to the situation discussed in* [CCL$^+$09] *the behaviour of*

$$\mathbb{P}^x(X_t \in I, T_0 > t), I \subset (0,\infty) \text{ an interval}$$

is in general not exactly exponential as $t \to \infty$.

3.2. **Applications to Bessel processes.** We apply our results to Bessel processes, i.e. diffusions associated to

$$\tau^\nu = -\frac{1}{2}\frac{d^2}{dx^2} - \frac{2\nu+1}{2x}\frac{d}{dx},$$

where $\nu \in \mathbb{R}$ (see [BS12] for basic facts). For $\nu \leq -1$ (the drift is pointing strongly enough to 0) it is known that 0 is an exit boundary – we will make use of this fact. We will consider regular perturbations

$$\tau^{\nu,c} = \tau^\nu + c(x)\frac{d}{dx}$$

of Bessel generators and give sufficient conditions for Assumption 1.5 to be satisfied. In particular we show that, $c \equiv 0$ and the examples given in Remark 4.6 of [CCL$^+$09], fulfill Assumption 1.5.

Proposition 3.10. *Consider the diffusion associated to the generator*

$$\tau^{\nu,c} = \tau^\nu + c(x)\frac{d}{dx}.$$

Assume that $\nu \leq -1$ and $c \in C^1([0,\infty))$ is such that $\inf_{s>0}(c(s)^2 - c'(s)) > -\infty$ and

$$\inf_{s\geq 1} \frac{c(s)}{s} > -\infty.$$

If, in addition, $\mathbb{P}^x(T_0 < \infty) = 1$ for all $x \in (0,\infty)$, then Assumption 1.5 holds.

Proof. We have to show, tat for $\varepsilon > 0$ the function $e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_{[0,\varepsilon]}$ belongs to L^2 with respect to the speed measure of the diffusion. Without loss of generality we can assume that $\varepsilon < 1$.

The strategy for the proof is as follows. First, we perform the reduction to a Bessel generator with potential term. Applying the Feynman-Kac representation of the Bessel semigroup with the new potential we consider the semigroup and the potential term separately. For the semigroup part we use facts about Bessel functions whereas for the potential part we perform a Khasminski-type argument.

The semigroup and generator corresponding to the differential expression $\tau^{\nu,c}$ will be denoted by $(P_t)_{t\geq 0}$ and L.

Stepy 1 (reduction of drift to potential): Let $C(x) := \int_1^x c(s)\,ds$ and denote by $\rho^{\nu,c}$ the speed measure of the diffusion associated to $\tau^{\nu,c}$. Define the family of operators $(\tilde{P}_t)_{t\geq 0}$ on $L^2((0,\infty),\rho^{\nu,c})$ via

$$\tilde{P}_t f(x) = e^{-C(x)/2}\left(P_t e^{C(\cdot)/2} f(\cdot)\right)(x).$$

Since

$$\int_0^\infty \left|f(x)e^{-C(x)/2}\right| \rho^{\nu,c}(dx) = \int_0^\infty |f(x)|^2 \rho^{\nu,0}(x) < \infty,$$

we have that $\tilde{P}_t f \in L^2((0,\infty),\rho^{\nu,0})$. We see by a simple calculation that the generator $\tilde{L}$ of the semigroup $(\tilde{P}_t)_{t\geq 0}$ acts on smooth functions with compact support via

$$\tilde{L}f(x) = \tau^\nu f(x) + \left[\frac{1}{2}(c^2(x) - c'(x)) - \frac{(-2\nu+1)c(x)}{x}\right] f(x).$$

As a result $(\tilde{P}_t)_{t\geq 0}$ is nothing but the Bessel semigroup corresponding to the index ν with additional potential. Let us see what we gain from this by inverting the transformation

(3.6)
$$\begin{aligned} e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_{[0,\varepsilon]}(x) &= P_t\mathbb{1}_{[0,\varepsilon]}(x) \\ &= e^{C(x)/2}\tilde{P}_t(e^{-C(\cdot)/2}\mathbb{1}_{[0,\varepsilon]})(x) \\ &= e^{C(x)/2}\mathbb{E}^x_\nu\left[e^{-C(X_t)/2}\mathbb{1}_{[0,\varepsilon]}(X_t)e^{-\int_0^t \frac{1}{2}(c^2(X_s)-c'(X_s))-\frac{(-2\nu+1)c(X_s)}{X_s}\,ds}, T_0 > t\right], \end{aligned}$$

where for the final step we used the Feynman-Kac representation for the Bessel semigroup with potential $\left[\frac{1}{2}(c^2(x) - c'(x)) - \frac{(-2\nu+1)c(x)}{x}\right]$. The right hand side of (3.6) can be split using Holder's inequality into the product of the following two terms

$$e^{C(x)/2}\mathbb{E}^x_\nu\left[\mathbb{1}_{[0,\varepsilon]}(X_t), T_0 > t\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \tag{3.7}$$

$$\mathbb{E}^x_\nu\left[e^{-C(X_t)/2}e^{-\int_0^t (c^2(X_s)-c'(X_s))-2\frac{(-2\nu+1)c(X_s)}{X_s}\,ds}\mathbb{1}_{[0,\varepsilon]}(X_t), T_0 > t\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \tag{3.8}$$

In the following two steps we estimate the two factors (3.7) and (3.8) separately, in order to show the square integrability in x.

Step 2 (estimating the semigroup factor (3.7)): To estimate this factor we neet to collect some facts on Bessel processes. Let I_ν denote the modified Bessel function of the first kind, i.e.

$$I_\nu = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(x/2)^{\nu+2k}}{k!\Gamma(\nu+k+1)}$$

and let R^ν denote the Bessel process. For $\nu \geq 0$ the process R^ν has the transition function

$$p^\nu(t,x,y) = \frac{1}{2t}(xy)^{-\nu}e^{-\frac{x^2+y^2}{2t}}I_\nu\left(\frac{xy}{t}\right)$$

with respect to the measure $m(dy) = 2y^{2\nu+1}dy$. From the h-transform property (see page 75 of [BS12]) we get that the transition function for the process $R^{-\nu}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} p^{-\nu}(t,x,y) &= \frac{1}{h(x)}p^\nu(t,x,y)h(y) = x^{2\nu}\frac{1}{2t}(xy)^{-\nu}e^{-\frac{x^2+y^2}{2t}}I_\nu\left(\frac{xy}{t}\right)y^{-2\nu} \\ &= \frac{1}{2t}x^\nu e^{-\frac{x^2+y^2}{2t}}I_\nu\left(\frac{xy}{t}\right)y^{-3\nu} \end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

where $h(x) := \frac{1}{2\nu}x^{-2\nu}$. Note that since we need 0 to be an exit boundary, we are only interested in $R^{-\nu}$ with $\nu \geq 1$. For the estimates we need some more basic facts on Bessel functions. Observe that for $y \in (0,1)$:

$$I_\nu\left(\frac{xy}{t}\right) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\frac{\left(\frac{xy}{2t}\right)^{\nu+2k}}{k!\Gamma(\nu+k+1)} \leq y^\nu\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\frac{\left(\frac{x}{2t}\right)^{\nu+2k}}{k!\Gamma(\nu+k+1)} = y^\nu I_\nu(x/t).$$

We can then obtain (recalling that ν is negative) an upper bound for (3.7)

$$\begin{aligned} e^{C(x)/2}\mathbb{E}^x_\nu\left[\mathbb{1}_{[0,\varepsilon]}(X_t), T_0 > t\right] &= e^{C(x)/2}\int_0^\varepsilon p^\nu(t,x,y)\, m(dy) \\ &= e^{C(x)/2}\frac{1}{2t}x^\nu e^{-\frac{x^2}{2t}} I_\nu(x/t)\int_0^\varepsilon e^{-\frac{y^2}{2t}} y\, dy. \end{aligned}$$

As such, it suffices to show that $e^{C(x)/2}\left(x^\nu e^{-\frac{x^2}{2t}} I_\nu(x/t)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \in L^2((0,\infty),\rho^{-\nu,c}$. This follows from the asymptotics

$$I_\nu(z) \sim \frac{1}{\Gamma(\nu+1)}\left(\frac{z}{2}\right)^\nu \text{ for small } z$$

and

$$I_\nu(z) \sim \frac{e^z}{\sqrt{2\pi z}} \text{ for large } z.$$

Step 3 (estimating the Bessel potential factor (3.8)): As (3.7) is square integrable it suffices to show that (3.8) is bounded in x. By the assumption on x, it suffices to show that

$$\sup_{x\in(0,\infty)} \mathbb{E}^x_\nu\left[e^{-2\int_0^t \mathbb{1}_{[0,1/2]}(X_s)\frac{(-2\nu+1)c(X_s)}{X_s}\, ds}\mathbb{1}_{[0,\varepsilon]}(X_t), T_0 > t\right] < \infty.$$

By the explicit expression for the heat kernel $p^\nu(t,x,y)$ for negative ν we see that

$$\lim_{t\to 0}\sup_{x\in(0,\infty)} \mathbb{E}^x_\nu[f(X_t), T_0 > t] = \lim_{t\to 0}\sup_{x\in(0,\infty)}\int_0^\infty p^\nu(t,x,y) f(y)\, m(dy) = 0, \tag{3.10}$$

where the function $f(0,\infty)\to(0,\infty)$ is defined by

$$f(y) = C\mathbb{1}_{(0,\varepsilon)}(y) y^{-1},$$

Observe that (3.10) gives for $t>0$ small enough and some $0<a<1$

$$\mathbb{E}^x_\nu\left[e^{\int_0^t f(X_s)\, ds}, T_0 > t\right] = \sum_{n\geq 0}\frac{1}{n!}\mathbb{E}^x_\nu\left[\left(\int_0^t f(X_s)\, ds\right)^n, T_0 > t\right] \leq \sum_{n\geq 0} a^n < \infty$$

This implies that for small $t>0$

$$\sup_{x\in(0,\infty)} \mathbb{E}^x_\nu\left[e^{-2\int_0^t \mathbb{1}_{[0,1/2]}(X_s)\frac{(-2\nu+1)c(X_s)}{X_s}\, ds}\mathbb{1}_{[0,\varepsilon]}(X_t), T_0 > t\right] < \infty.$$

By the Markov property the above remains true for every $t>0$. This completes the proof of the first assertion from Assumption 1.5. The L^2 convergence of $e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_{[\varepsilon,z]}$ follows similar calculations which we leave to the reader. □

3.3. **Entrance boundary at ∞.** We are now ready to prove

Theorem 3.11. *If 0 is an exit boundary and ∞ is an entrance boundary, then $\lambda_0 > 0$ and $(X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ converges to a quasistationary distribution.*

The strategy used is similar to the proof of Theorem 3.5. Things are simplified because by the spectral representation of Theorem 2.4 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t\to\infty}\frac{e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_A(x)}{e^{-tL}\mathbb{1}_{(0,\infty)}(x)} &= \lim_{t\to\infty}\frac{e^{\lambda_0 t}\int_A p(t,x,y)\rho(dy)}{e^{\lambda_0 t}\int_0^\infty p(t,x,y)\rho(dy)} \\ &= \lim_{t\to\infty}\frac{\int_A \sum_k e^{(\lambda_0-\lambda_k)t}u_{\lambda_k}(x)u_{\lambda_k}(y)\rho(dy)}{\int_0^\infty \sum_k e^{(\lambda_0-\lambda_k)t}u_{\lambda_k}(x)u_{\lambda_k}(y)\rho(dy)} \end{aligned}$$

which by the order of the eigenvalues already proves the theorem if we are allowed to interchange the limit and the integration. We make use of the parabolic Harnack inequality, which in this setting seems to go back to [CCL$^+$09].

Proof. We have seen in Theorem 2.4 that for infinity being an entrance boundary the spectrum of L is purely discrete and the lowest eigenfunction is integrable with respect to ρ. Moreover, it follows from the spectral representation of Theorem 2.4 that

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} e^{\lambda_0 t} p(t,x,y) = c u_{\lambda_0}(x) u_{\lambda_0}(y), \tag{3.11}$$

where c is a normalizing and u_{λ_0} is the unique positive eigenfunction, normalized to $\|u_{\lambda_0}\|_{L^2((0,\infty),\rho)} = 1$, corresponding to the lowest eigenvalue λ_0. Using the parabolic Harnack principle as in [CCL$^+$09] (see the proof of their Lemma 5.3) and [KS12] we get for some locally bounded function $\Theta : (0,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$, every $z \in (0,\infty)$ with $|z-x| < \delta(x) = \frac{1}{2} \wedge \frac{x}{2}$ and every $y \in (0,\infty)$ that

$$p(t,x,y) \le \Theta(x) p(t+1,z,y).$$

This implies

$$\begin{aligned} p(t,x,y) &= \frac{\int_{|z-x|<\delta(x)} p(t,z,y) u_{\lambda_0}(z)\rho(dx)}{\int_{|z-x|<\delta(x)} u_{\lambda_0}(z)\rho(dx)} \\ &\le \frac{\Theta(x)}{\int_{|z-x|<\delta(x)} u_{\lambda_0}(z)\rho(dx)} e^{-\lambda_0(t+1)} u_{\lambda_0}(y) \end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

which is integrable as u_{λ_0} is integrable. We translate the probabilistic object of interest to the above

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t\to\infty} \mathbb{P}^\nu(X_t \in A \mid T_0 > t) &= \lim_{t\to\infty} \frac{\mathbb{P}^\nu(X_t \in A, T_0 > t)}{\mathbb{P}^\nu(X_t \in (0,\infty), T_0 > t)} \\ &= \lim_{t\to\infty} \frac{\left\langle e^{-tL} \mathbb{1}_A(\cdot), \nu \right\rangle}{\left\langle e^{-tL} \mathbb{1}_{(0,\infty)} A(\cdot), \nu \right\rangle} \\ &= \lim_{t\to\infty} \frac{e^{\lambda_0 t} \left\langle \int_A p(t,\cdot,y)\rho(dy), \nu \right\rangle}{e^{\lambda_0 t} \left\langle \int_0^\infty p(t,\cdot,y)\rho(dy), \nu \right\rangle} \end{aligned}$$

Taking account of the above bounds we can use dominated convergence to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t\to\infty} \mathbb{P}^\nu(X_t \in A \mid T_0 > t) &= \frac{\int_0^\infty \int_A \lim_{t\to\infty} e^{\lambda_0 t} p(t,x,y)\nu(dx)\rho(dy)}{\int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \lim_{t\to\infty} e^{\lambda_0 t} p(t,x,y)\nu(dx)\rho(dy)} \\ &= \frac{\int_0^\infty \int_A u_{\lambda_0}(x) u_{\lambda_0}(y)\nu(dx)\rho(dy)}{\int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty u_{\lambda_0}(x) u_{\lambda_0}(y)\nu(dx)\rho(dy)} \\ &= \frac{\int_A u_{\lambda_0}(y)\rho(dy)}{\int_0^\infty u_{\lambda_0}(y)\rho(dy)} \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. □

3.4. **An application to a diffusion coming from population dynamics.** We apply Theorem 3.11 to study a diffusion from population dynamics. Consider the SDE

$$dN_t = (\mu N_t - \kappa N_t^2)\, dt + \sigma N_t\, dW_t + \sqrt{\gamma N_t}\, dB_t \tag{3.13}$$

where $(W_t)_{t\ge 0}$ and $(B_t)_{t\ge 0}$ are independent Brownian motions, $\mu, \kappa, \sigma, \gamma \in (0,\infty)$ and $N_0 > 0$. This process arises naturally as a scaling limit of branching diffusions in a random environment. See [Hut11], [BH12], [Lam05] and Section 4 for more details.

The quadratic variation of the process $(N_t)_{t\geq 0}$ is

$$d[N]_t = (\gamma N_t + \sigma^2 N_t^2)\, dt.$$

As a result, there exists a Brownian motion $(U_t)_{t\geq 0}$ such that

$$dN_t = (\mu N_t - \kappa N_t^2)\, dt + \sqrt{\gamma N_t + \sigma^2 N_t^2} dU_t. \tag{3.14}$$

Our diffusion $(N_t)_{t\geq 0}$ has drift $b(z) = \mu z - \kappa z^2$ and diffusion coefficient $\sigma(z) = \sqrt{\gamma z + \sigma^2 z^2}$. The scale function will thus be, for some constants $a, c > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} s(x) &= \int_c^x \exp\left(-\int_a^y \frac{2b(z)}{\sigma^2(z)}\, dz\right) dy \\ &= \int_c^x \exp\left(-\int_a^y \frac{2(\mu z - \kappa z^2)}{\gamma z + \sigma^2 z^2}\, dz\right) dy \\ &= \int_c^x \left(\frac{\gamma + \sigma^2 y}{\gamma + \sigma^2 a}\right)^{-2\left(\frac{\mu}{\sigma^2} + \frac{\gamma\kappa}{\sigma^4}\right)} e^{\frac{2\kappa}{\sigma^2}(y-a)}\, dy. \end{aligned}$$

One can also find the density of the speed measure of $(N_t)_{t\geq 0}$. Namely,

$$\begin{aligned} m(z) &= \frac{1}{\sigma^2(z) s'(z)} \\ &= \left(\frac{\gamma + \sigma^2 z}{\gamma + \sigma^2 a}\right)^{2\left(\frac{\mu}{\sigma^2} + \frac{\gamma\kappa}{\sigma^4}\right)} e^{-\frac{2\kappa}{\sigma^2}(z-a)} \frac{1}{\gamma z + \sigma^2 z^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we follow [KT81] to classify the boundary points 0 and ∞.

Proposition 3.12. *Consider the diffusion given by* (3.14)*. The point* 0 *is an exit boundary and the point* ∞ *is an entrance boundary.*

Proof. Define

$$M(0, x] = \lim_{l \downarrow 0} \int_l^x m(z)\, dz$$

and

$$\Sigma(0) = \int_0^x \left(\int_0^\xi s'(\eta)\, d\eta\right) m(\xi)\, d\xi.$$

Note that for small $z > 0$

$$m(z) \sim \frac{1}{\gamma z + \sigma^2 z^2}$$

while $s'(z)$ is bounded for small z. It is therefore easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned} M(0, x] &\sim \lim_{l \downarrow 0} \int_l^x \frac{1}{\gamma z + \sigma^2 z^2}\, dz \\ &\sim \lim_{l \downarrow 0} \ln \frac{z}{\gamma + \sigma^2 z} \Big|_l^x \\ &\sim \lim_{l \downarrow 0} -\ln \frac{l}{\gamma + \sigma^2 l} \\ &= \infty. \end{aligned}$$

$$\Sigma(0) = \int_0^x \left(\int_0^\xi \left(\frac{\gamma + \sigma^2 \eta}{\gamma + \sigma^2 a}\right)^{-2\left(\frac{\mu}{\sigma^2} + \frac{\gamma\kappa}{\sigma^4}\right)} e^{\frac{2\kappa}{\sigma^2}(\eta - a)}\, d\eta\right) m(\xi)\, d\xi$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\sim \int_0^x \xi m(\xi)\,d\xi \\ &\sim \int_0^x \xi \frac{1}{\gamma\xi+\sigma^2\xi^2}\,d\xi \\ &= \int_0^x \frac{1}{\gamma+\sigma^2\xi}\,d\xi \\ &< \infty. \end{aligned}$$

According to Table 6.2 in [KT81] the above imply that 0 is an exit boundary.

Let us look at the boundary at ∞. To simplify notation, without loss of generality, let us write

$$\begin{aligned} s'(\xi) &= (1+\xi)^{-C}e^{D\xi} \\ m(\xi) &= \frac{1}{\gamma\xi+\sigma^2\xi}(1+\eta)^C e^{-D\xi} \end{aligned}$$

for some $D, C > 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{N}(\infty) &:= \int_x^\infty \left(\int_\xi^\infty m(\xi)\,d\xi\right) s'(\eta)\,d\eta \\ &= \int_x^\infty \left(\int_\eta^\infty \frac{1}{\gamma\xi+\sigma^2\xi^2}(1+\xi)^C e^{-D\xi}\,d\xi\right)(1+\eta)^{-C}e^{D\eta}\,d\eta \\ &\le \int_x^\infty \left(\int_\eta^\infty (1+\xi)^C e^{-D\xi}\,d\xi\right)\frac{1}{\gamma\eta+\sigma^2\eta^2}(1+\eta)^{-C}e^{D\eta}\,d\eta \end{aligned}$$

Using integration by parts

$$\int_\eta^\infty (1+\xi)^C e^{-D\xi}\,d\xi = \frac{1}{D}e^{-D\eta}(1+\eta)^C + \int_\eta^\infty \frac{1}{D}e^{-D\xi}C(1+\xi)^{-C-1}\,d\xi$$

and therefore

$$\int_\eta^\infty (1+\xi)^C e^{-D\xi}\,d\xi \simeq \frac{1}{D}e^{-D\eta}(1+\eta)^C \text{ for } \eta\to\infty$$

As a result we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{N}(\infty) &\simeq \int_x^\infty \left(\frac{1}{D}e^{-D\eta}(1+\eta)^C\right)\frac{1}{\gamma\eta+\sigma^2\eta^2}(1+\eta)^{-C}e^{D\eta}\,d\eta \\ &\simeq \int_x^\infty \frac{1}{\gamma\eta+\sigma^2\eta^2}\,d\eta \\ &< \infty. \end{aligned}$$

One also clearly has

$$\begin{aligned} s(\infty) &= \int_c^\infty \left(\frac{\gamma+\sigma^2 y}{\gamma+\sigma^2 a}\right)^{-2\left(\frac{\mu}{\sigma^2}+\frac{\gamma\kappa}{\sigma^4}\right)} e^{\frac{2\kappa}{\sigma^2}(y-a)}\,dy \\ &= \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Making use again of Table 6.2 from [KT81] we conclude that ∞ is an entrance boundary. □

Combining Proposition 3.12 and Theorem 3.11 one gets the following result.

Corollary 3.13. *Consider the diffusion given by* (3.13)*. Then* $(N_t)_{t\ge 0}$ *converges to a quasistationary distribution.*

Remark 3.14. *We note that the methods from* [CCL$^+$09] *are not easy to use for the diffusion from* (3.13) *because one needs to check extra assumptions. In our case having that* 0 *is exit and* ∞ *is entrance is enough to give us the desired result.*

4. Study of a class of diffusions with internal killing for which 0 is natural and ∞ entrance

We study the long time behavior of a stochastic one-dimensional diffusion process $(N_t)_{t\geq 0}$ with internal killing. The unkilled process can be seen as describing the population abundance N_t at time $t \geq 0$ of a species and evolves according to a stochastic differential equation (SDE) of the following type

$$\begin{aligned} dN_t &= (\mu N_t - cN_t^2)\, dt + \sigma N_t dW_t,\ t > 0 \\ N_0 &= x_0 > 0, \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

where

- $\mu > 0$ is the mean per-capita growth rate,
- σ^2 is the 'infinitesimal' variance of fluctuations in the per-capita growth rate,
- $-cN_t^2$ for $c > 0$ is due to competition for resources

and $(W_t)_{t\geq 0}$ is a standard Brownian motion. This model has been used in the literature, see [EHS15, ERSS13, LM09, LWW11], and can be seen as a stochastic version of the logistic growth model (or a Lotka-Volterra process). It can be shown, see for example [EHS15], that this process never dies out, that is, that $N_t > 0$ for all $t \geq 0$. It is also standard to prove (see [EHS15]) that the process has a nontrivial stationary distribution on $(0, \infty)$ if and only if $\mu - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} > 0$.

Isolated populations with no immigration usually die out in nature in a finite time $T_\partial < \infty$. Therefore, it makes sense to introduce in our model an internal killing rate $\kappa : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$ and kill the population N_t at the rate $\kappa(N_t)$. One specific killing rate we are interested in is $\kappa_0(x) := \frac{1}{x}$. This killing rate is natural in the following sense: when the population N_t gets small, individuals will have difficulty finding mates or defending themselves from predators, and therefore the killing rate $\kappa_0(N_t) = \frac{1}{N_t}$ will be large.

Using killing rates is not new in biology and genetics. In [HO00] a killing rate $\kappa_0(x) = \frac{1}{x}$ is used to model the rate of patch extinction in metapopulations.

[KT83] study diffusion processes arising as scaling limits of discrete models of gene formation and detection in finite populations. The diffusions one gets are governed not only by their drift and diffusion terms but also by a state dependent killing rate, that corresponds to the formation of certain types of individuals.

Another interpretation of the killing rate in our model could also be the following: Similar to the model from [KT83], one might be interested in detecting the first appearance of a non-native invasive species whose dynamics is governed by (4.1). In this case, a detection rate (which gives us the killing rate) proportional to the population density seems natural.

One question to ask in this setting is whether there exists a quasistationary distribution. That is, whether conditioned on not dying out (which we model by the absorption of N_t by a cemetery state ∂) there is convergence to equilibrium.

Remark 4.1. *If one has a finite population model then extinction is always possible if you are unlucky enough (with you needing to be less unlucky the smaller the population is), whereas in an ODE/PDE/SDE/SPDE scaling limit the population can get arbitrarily small and still recover. See for example* [DL94]. *This is exactly what happens in our*

case, since the population given by (4.1) *does not go extinct in finite time if there is no killing. Introducing the killing* $\kappa(x)$ *as we do seems like one way of "patching up" a scaling limit to incorporate the perils of extinction that arise in the finite population setting when the population is small.*

4.1. **Prelimiting model.** Here we discuss how one can get the SDE (4.1) as a scaling limit of a discrete system. We follow parts of Section 2.4 from [Lam05]. First, define the Feller diffusion with logistic growth started at x by

$$\begin{aligned} dU_t &= (\mu U_t - cU_t^2)\,dt + \sqrt{\gamma U_t}\,dB_t \\ U_0 &= x > 0 \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

where $\mu, c, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Denote by $(U_t^{(n)}, t \geq 0)$ the Markov process living on $n^{-1}\mathbb{N}$, started at $n^{-1}\lceil nx \rceil$, stopped at 0 and with the following transition kernels

- $U_t^{(n)}$ goes up by $\frac{1}{n}$ at rate $(\frac{\gamma}{2}n + \lambda)n^2 U_t^{(n)}$,
- $U_t^{(n)}$ goes down by $\frac{1}{n}$ at rate $(\frac{\gamma}{2}n + \delta)n^2 U_t^{(n)}$,
- $U_t^{(n)}$ goes down by $\frac{1}{n}$ at rate $cn^2 U_t^{(n)}(U_t^{(n)} - n^{-1})$,

for positive constants $c, \delta, \gamma, \lambda$. Set $\mu = \lambda - \delta$. Then, as $n \to \infty$, the sequence $(U_t^{(n)}, t \geq 0)_n$ converges weakly to the Feller diffusion with logistic growth given by (4.2).

If we look at a random environment version, see [Myt96] and [BS12], of the setup from above we can get the following SDE as a scaling limit of a discrete system

$$\begin{aligned} dV_t &= (\mu V_t - cV_t^2)\,dt + \sigma V_t\,dW_t + \sqrt{\gamma V_t}\,dB_t \\ V_0 &= x > 0 \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

where (W, B) is a standard two dimensional Brownian motion.

The basic observation is that in a branching process where the offspring distribution has mean μ and variance σ^2 and there are currently M individuals, the conditional distribution of the number of individuals in the next generation has mean

$$M\mu$$

and variance

$$M\sigma^2 = (\sqrt{M}\sigma)^2.$$

The $V_t dW_t$ type term comes from stochastic variations in the mean of the offspring distribution that every individual shares, whereas the $\sqrt{V_t}dB_t$ type term comes from the independent randomness around that common mean in the number of offspring that different individuals have.

If we now let $\gamma \downarrow 0$ in (4.3) we can recover, at least heuristically, our SDE

$$\begin{aligned} dN_t &= (\mu N_t - cN_t^2)\,dt + \sigma N_t dW_t,\ t > 0 \\ N_0 &= x > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 4.2. *If one has a finite population model then extinction is always possible if you are unlucky enough (with you needing to be less unlucky the smaller the population is), whereas in an ODE/PDE/SDE/SPDE scaling limit the population can get arbitrarily small and still recover. See for example* [DL94]. *This is exactly what happens in our case, since the population given by* (4.1) *does not go extinct in finite time if there is no killing. Introducing the killing* $\kappa(x)$ *as we do seems like one way of "patching up" a scaling limit to incorporate the perils of extinction that arise in the finite population setting when the population is small.*

4.2. **The model.** Suppose Z is given by the SDE

$$\begin{aligned} dZ_t &= b(Z_t)\,dt + dW_t \\ Z_0 &= z_0 \in (-\infty, \infty). \end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

We assume throughout this paper that (4.4) has strong unique solutions. We refer the reader to Definitions 1.1, 1.2 and Remark 3.7 for the meaning of the concepts of quasistationary distribution and Yaglom limit in the setting with internal killing.

We will show that a Yaglom limit exists in our setting, and thus that there exists a quasistationary distribution.

A distribution $\tilde{\nu}$ is said to *attract* all initial distributions ν compactly supported in $(0, \infty)$ if

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \mathbb{P}^\nu(Z_t \in \bullet \mid T_\partial > t) = \tilde{\nu}(\bullet).$$

The unkilled diffusion Z given by (4.4) with $\kappa \equiv 0$ has the Feller semigroup

$$T_t f(x) := \mathbb{E}^x[f(X_t)]$$

with generator given by

$$-\mathcal{L} := \frac{1}{2}\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + b(x)\frac{d}{dx}. \tag{4.5}$$

If we add killing κ the Feller semigroup becomes

$$T_t^\kappa f(x) := \mathbb{E}^x[f(Z_t), T_\partial > t]$$

and the generator

$$-\mathcal{L}_\kappa := \frac{1}{2}\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + b(x)\frac{d}{dx} - \kappa(x). \tag{4.6}$$

Note that we also have the relations

$$\begin{aligned} T_t &= e^{-t\mathcal{L}} \\ T_t^\kappa &= e^{-t\mathcal{L}_\kappa}. \end{aligned}$$

The operators $\mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{L}_\kappa$ will play an important role in our arguments. For a classification of the boundary points of one dimensional diffusions we refer the reader to Chapter 3 from [LB10] or Table 6.2 from [KT81].

Our main interest lies in the SDE

$$\begin{aligned} dN_t &= (\mu N_t - cN_t^2)\,dt + \sigma N_t dW_t,\ t > 0 \\ N_0 &= x_0 \in (0, \infty) \end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

together with a killing rate $\kappa : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_+$. We want to make this be of type (4.4). The change of variables $X = \frac{\log N_t}{\sigma}$ combined with an easy application of Ito's formula yields

$$\begin{aligned} dX_t &= (A - ae^{\sigma X_t})\,dt + dW_t,\ t > 0 \\ X_0 &= \frac{\log x_0}{\sigma} \in (-\infty, \infty) \\ k(x) &= \kappa(e^{\sigma x}) \end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

where $k(x)$ is the new killing rate and

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \frac{1}{\sigma}\left(\mu - \frac{\sigma^2}{2}\right) \\ a &= \frac{c}{\sigma}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that in the case $\kappa_0(x) = \frac{1}{x}$ we get $k_0(x) = e^{-\sigma x}$. We will denote the drift of the SDE from (4.8) by

$$\tilde{b}(x) = (A - ae^{\sigma x}),$$

and the density of the speed measure Γ for the unkilled diffusion X by

$$\tilde{\rho}(x) = \exp\left(\int_{-\infty}^{x} 2\tilde{b}(s)\,ds\right). \tag{4.9}$$

We will show that (4.8) has a quasistationary distribution which in turn will imply that (4.7) has a quasistationary distribution. This is true because X and N are related by a change of variables, so that results about X can be translated immediately to results about N.

Remark 4.3. *Our problem does not fit in the setting of* [CCL$^+$09] *because it has internal killing and the state space is* $(-\infty, \infty)$ *instead of* $(0, \infty)$*. Additionally, in* [CCL$^+$09] *the authors assume that the diffusion gets absorbed a.s. in finite time at* 0*, while in our case* $-\infty$ *will be an inaccessible boundary point. We cannot make use of the general results from* [SE07, KS12] *because both of our boundary points* $-\infty, \infty$ *are inaccessible (that is, the diffusion* X *cannot reach the boundaries in finite time). More exactly, in our case,* $-\infty$ *is a natural boundary while* ∞ *is an entrance boundary. Our example shows that the study of a killed diffusion with two inaccessible boundary points can arise from the study of a biological system - it is not interesting only from an academic point of view.*

Most studies regarding the existence of quasistationary distributions work with a diffusion on $(0, \infty)$ *where* 0 *is a regular boundary and* ∞ *is a natural boundary. As explained in* [Kol09]*, when the left boundary is not regular, the spectrum of the generator of a killed diffusion does not always have multiplicity 1. For two inaccessible boundary points a spectral* matrix *might have to be used in the spectral representation. However, we are able to prove that in our setting* $\mathcal{L}_\kappa$ *has multiplicity one. We actually show that* $\mathcal{L}_\kappa$ *has a discrete spectrum,* $\sigma(\mathcal{L}_\kappa) = \{\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \dots\}$ *with* $\lambda_0 < \lambda_1 < \dots$ *and that the bottom of the spectrum* λ_0 *has multiplicity 1. Finally, we prove that the eigenfunction* ϕ_0 *associated to* λ_0 *is strictly positive and that* $\phi_0 \in L^1(\mathbb{R}, \rho(y)\,dy)$*. These facts will then imply the existence of a Yaglom limit for our system.*

4.3. **Existence of the Yaglom limit.** The next theorem presents a first step towards a general result regarding the existence of a quasistationary distribution for a diffusion with 0 natural and ∞ entrance.

Theorem 4.4. *Suppose* Z *is a diffusion living on* $\mathbb{R}$ *with generator*

$$-\mathcal{L} := \frac{1}{2}\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + b(\cdot)\frac{d}{dx} = \frac{1}{2\rho(\cdot)}\frac{d}{dx}\rho(\cdot)\frac{d}{dx}$$

where, as in (4.9)*,*

$$\rho = \exp\left(\int_{-\infty}^{x} 2b(s)\,ds\right)$$

is the density of the speed measure of Z*. Assume furthermore that* $-\infty$ *is a natural boundary,* ∞ *is an entrance boundary and that* $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \rho\,dx < \infty$*. Suppose* Z^κ *is the diffusion with generator*

$$-\mathcal{L}_\kappa := \frac{1}{2}\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + b(x)\frac{d}{dx} - \kappa(x), \tag{4.10}$$

and that the killing rate $\kappa(x)$ *satisfies*

$$\lim_{x\to-\infty} q(x) = -\infty \tag{4.11}$$

where

$$q(x) := -\kappa(x) - \frac{1}{2}(|b(x)|^2 - b'(x)).$$

Then the process $(Z_t^\kappa)_{t\geq 0}$ has a quasistationary distribution π. Moreover, the quasistationary distribution π is a Yaglom limit and attracts all compactly supported probability measures on $(0,\infty)$.

Remark 4.5. *Note that we looked at diffusions with diffusion coefficient equal to 1. The case of a general nondegenerate diffusion coefficient, i.e. a diffusion Z^σ with generator*

$$\frac{\sigma^2(x)}{2}\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + b(x)\frac{d}{dx}$$

can be reduced to the present case via a change of variables. We follow [SE04] *to show this. Suppose σ is twice continuously differentiable and strictly positive. Replace Z_t^σ by $R_t := F(Z_t^\sigma)$, where $F(x) := \int_c^x dy/\sigma(u)$, for an arbitrary point $c \in \mathbb{R}$. The killing rate for R_t becomes $\kappa(F^{-1}(R_t))$, while the drift can be seen to be*

$$\frac{b(F^{-1}(R_t))}{\sigma(F^{-1}(Y_t))} - \sigma'(F^{-1}(R_t)).$$

Since by assumption σ is strictly positive, this transformation is finite.

Theorem 4.4 can be applied in the case of a general diffusion coefficient. We take $\sigma(x) = 1$ to simplify the computations.

Proof. The proof relies on some basic analytic properties which will be shown below. First, according to Lemma 4.6 the operator $\mathcal{L}_\kappa$ has compact resolvent and thus the spectrum $\sigma(\mathcal{L}_\kappa)$ is purely discrete. Standard theory implies that $\mathcal{L}_\kappa$ is negative definite and that the semigroup $(e^{t\mathcal{L}_\kappa})_{t\geq 0}$ is positivity improving. Thus a direct application of standard results from functional analysis such as the Perron-Frobenius theorem (see e.g. Satz 17.13 in [Wei12]) implies that the largest eigenvalue λ_0 of $\mathcal{L}_\kappa$ is strictly negative and has multiplicity 1. Moreover, the unique (modulo constants) eigenfunction $\phi_0 \in L^2(\rho)$ corresponding to λ_0 can be chosen to be strictly positive. The spectral theorem for selfadjoint operators implies that

$$e^{t\mathcal{L}_\kappa}\phi_0 = e^{\lambda_0 t}\phi_0.$$

The measure $\pi(dx) := \phi_0(x)\rho(dx)$ is therefore λ_0–invariant as for every $u \in L^2(\rho)$

$$\begin{aligned}\int \rho(dx)\phi_0(x)\mathbb{E}^x\big[u(Z_t), T_\partial > t\big] &= \langle \phi_0, e^{-t\mathcal{L}_\kappa}u\rangle_{L^2(\rho)} = \langle e^{t\mathcal{L}_\kappa}\phi_0, u\rangle_{L^2(\rho)} \\ &= e^{\lambda_0 t}\int \rho(dx)\phi_0(x)u(x)\end{aligned}$$

where $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{L^2(\rho)}$ denotes the inner product in $L^2(\rho)$. Thus we have

$$\int \pi(dx)\mathbb{P}^x\big(Z_t \in \cdot, T_\partial > t\big) = e^{\lambda_0 t}\pi(\cdot)$$

and it is therefore enough to show that π is a finite measure. Observe that in our situation the measure ρ is a finite measure since by assumption $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \rho\, dx < \infty$, and therefore $\phi_0 \in L^2(\rho) \subset L^1(\rho)$. As a result

$$\mathbb{P}^\pi(Z_t \in \cdot \mid T_\partial > t) = \frac{\int \pi(dx)\mathbb{P}_x\big(Z_t \in \cdot, T_\partial > t\big)}{\int \pi(dx)\mathbb{P}_x\big(T_\partial > t\big)} = \frac{e^{\lambda_0 t}\pi(\cdot)}{e^{\lambda_0 t}\int \rho(dx)\phi_0(x)} = \frac{\pi(\cdot)}{\int \pi(dx)}$$

which shows that $\frac{\pi}{\int \pi(dx)}$ is a quasistationary distribution for Z.

Let us now show that all compactly supported initial distributions are attracted by the quasistationary distribution π. Fix $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, and $r > 0$. Pick any $f \in L^\infty(\rho) \subset L^1(\rho)$ and observe, using arguments similar to the ones from Lemma 2.1 in [KS12], that for every $x \in (x_0 - r, x_0 + r)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left|e^{t\mathcal{L}_\kappa} f(x) - e^{\lambda_0 t}\phi_0(x)\right| &= \left|e^{t\mathcal{L}_\kappa}(f - \phi_0)(x)\right| \\ &\leq C_{x_0,r}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} |f'(z)|^2 \rho(dz) + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \kappa(z)|f(z)|\rho(dz)\right)\end{aligned}$$

where $C_{x_0,r}$ is a finite real number. Therefore, we get

$$\sup_{x\in(x_0-r,x_0+r)} e^{\lambda_1 t}\left|e^{t\mathcal{L}_\kappa} f(x) - e^{\lambda_0 t}\phi_0(x)\right| \to 0$$

as $t \to \infty$ by the spectral theorem for selfadjoint operators. □

Lemma 4.6. *The operator $\mathcal{L}_\kappa$ from* (4.10) *has a compact resolvent.*

Proof. We will prove the assertion in three steps. First we show that one can consider the two boundaries ∞ and $-\infty$ separately and then we will use standard results in order to establish compactness. At the boundary ∞ the compactness will be due to the strong drift towards 0 and at $-\infty$ we use the fact that the killing rate is large.
Step 1: Let us denote by ${\mathcal{L}_\kappa}^+$ the selfadjoint realization of the operator $\mathcal{L}_\kappa$ in $L^2((0,\infty),\rho)$ with Dirichlet boundary condition at 0. Observe that the boundary ∞ is in the limit point case as shown in Lemma 3.1 of [KS12] and thus no boundary condition has to be specified there. Similarly, let ${\mathcal{L}_\kappa}^-$ be the selfadjoint realization of the operator $\mathcal{L}_\kappa$ in $L^2((-\infty,0),\rho)$ with Dirichlet boundary condition at 0. Again, $-\infty$ is in the limit point case and thus ${\mathcal{L}_\kappa}^-$ has a unique selfadjoint realization. We identify

$$L^2((-\infty,\infty),\rho) = L^2((\infty,0),\rho) \oplus L^2((0,\infty),\rho)$$

and denote by $\mathcal{L}_\kappa^{\mathcal{D}}$ the operator ${\mathcal{L}_\kappa}^+ \oplus {\mathcal{L}_\kappa}^-$. Arguing as in the proof of Lemma 3.3 in [KS12] one concludes that the difference of the resolvents

$$(\mathcal{L}_\kappa - z)^{-1} - (\mathcal{L}_\kappa^{\mathcal{D}} - z)^{-1}$$

for $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus (\sigma(\mathcal{L}_\kappa) \cup \sigma(\mathcal{L}_\kappa^D))$ is a rank one operator and therefore in particular compact. By Weyl's result about the stability of essential spectra we conclude that it suffices to prove that the essential spectrum of $\mathcal{L}_k^D$ is empty. The essential spectrum of ${\mathcal{L}_\kappa}^D$ is empty if the essential spectra of ${\mathcal{L}_\kappa}^\pm$ are both empty.
Step 2: We consider the case ${\mathcal{L}_\kappa}^+$ first. Observe that ∞ is an entrance boundary. According to Theorem 3.16 in [KS12] we conclude that ${\mathcal{L}_\kappa}^+$ is purely discrete and thus the essential spectrum is empty.
Step 3: In order to deal with the operator ${\mathcal{L}_\kappa}^-$ we use the following well known fact. If the continuous function $q : (-\infty, 0] \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfies

$$\lim_{x\to-\infty} q(x) = -\infty$$

then the spectrum of the operator $\frac{1}{2}\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + q$ in $L^2((-\infty,0),dx)$ with Dirichlet boundary condition at 0 is purely discrete. Using the unitary transformation U given by

$$U : L^2((-\infty,0),\rho(y)dy) \to L^2((\infty,0),dy), f \mapsto \sqrt{\rho} f$$

we see that the operator $-{\mathcal{L}_\kappa}^-$ is unitarily equivalent to the operator $\frac{1}{2}\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + q$ in $L^2((-\infty,0),dx)$ with

$$q(x) = -\kappa(y) - \frac{1}{2}\big(|b(y)|^2 - b'(y)\big).$$

Since by assumption $\lim_{x\to-\infty} q(x) = -\infty$ we are done. □

Let us collect some well known results about the unkilled diffusion $(N_t)_{t\geq 0}$ given by (4.1).

Proposition 4.7. *Assume $\mu - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} > 0$. The diffusion given by the SDE (4.1) is well defined and lives in $\mathbb{R}_{++} := (0,\infty)$, that is, for all $t \geq 0$ we have $N_t \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$. The boundary points 0 and ∞ are both inaccessible for the diffusion $(N_t)_{t\geq 0}$. More specifically, 0 is a natural boundary and ∞ is an entrance boundary. Furthermore, the process converges weakly to its unique stationary distribution which is a Gamma distribution with density $x \mapsto \frac{1}{\Gamma(\lambda)\theta^\lambda} x^{\lambda-1} e^{-\frac{x}{\theta}}$ having parameters $\theta := \frac{\sigma^2}{2c}$ and $\lambda := \frac{2\mu}{\sigma^2} - 1$.*

Proof. See [EHS15]. □

As an immediate consequence we get the following Corollary.

Corollary 4.8. *Suppose that $A, a, \sigma > 0$. The unkilled diffusion $(X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ given by (4.8) is well defined and lives in $\mathbb{R}$. The left boundary $-\infty$ is a natural boundary and the right boundary $+\infty$ is an entrance boundary. Moreover, $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{\rho}(x)\,dx < \infty$ since X has a nontrivial stationary distribution.*

Proof. Apply the results from proposition 4.7 together with the fact that $X_t = \log N_t$. □

As already mentioned in the beginning of Section 4 our main result concerns the existence of a quasistationary distribution for the process $(N_t)_{t\geq 0}$. Instead of proving this for N_t directly we first show X_t has a quasistationary distribution. It is then trivial to note that N_t also has a quasistationary distribution.

Corollary 4.9. *The killed diffusion given by*

$$\begin{aligned} dN_t &= (\mu N_t - cN_t^2)\,dt + \sigma N_t dW_t,\ t > 0 \\ N_0 &= x_0 \in (0,\infty) \\ \kappa(x) &= \frac{1}{x}. \end{aligned}$$

has a quasistationary distribution which attracts all compactly supported probability measures on $(0,\infty)$.

Proof. Note that since

$$\lim_{x\to-\infty} q(x) = \lim_{x\to-\infty} \left(-e^{-\sigma x} - \frac{1}{2}|A - ae^{\sigma x}|^2 + \frac{1}{2}a\sigma e^{\sigma x} \right) = -\infty$$

by Theorem 4.4 and Corollary 4.8 the process $(X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ with the killing rate $k(x) = \kappa(e^{\sigma x}) = e^{-\sigma x}$ has a quasistationary distribution which attracts all compactly supported probability measures on $(-\infty,\infty)$. It is then immediate that $N_t = e^{\sigma X_t}$ also has a quasistationary distribution which attracts all compactly supported probability measures on $(0,\infty)$. □

Acknowledgments. We thank Nicolas Champagnat, Leif Döring, Alison Etheridge, Steve Evans, Fritz Gesztesy, Sebastian Schreiber and Denis Villemonais for very insightful comments and suggestions.

References

[AG54] N. I. Achieser and I. M. Glasmann, *Theorie der linearen operatoren im hilbert-raum*, vol. 1054, Berlin Akademie-Verlag, 1954.

[BH12] C. Boeinghoff and M. Hutzenthaler, *Branching diffusions in random environment*, Markov Processes and Related Fields **18** (2012), no. 2.

[BS12] A. N. Borodin and P. Salminen, *Handbook of brownian motion-facts and formulae*, Birkhäuser, 2012.

[CCL+09] P. Cattiaux, P. Collet, A. Lambert, S. Martínez, S. Méléard, and J. San Martín, *Quasi-stationary distributions and diffusion models in population dynamics*, The Annals of Probability (2009), 1926–1969.

[CMSM95] P. Collet, S. Martínez, and J. San Martín, *Asymptotic laws for one-dimensional diffusions conditioned to nonabsorption*, The Annals of Probability (1995), 1300–1314.

[CV15a] N. Champagnat and D. Villemonais, *Exponential convergence to quasi-stationary distribution for absorbed one-dimensional diffusions with killing*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1510.05794 (2015).

[CV15b] ———, *Exponential convergence to quasi-stationary distribution for one-dimensional diffusions*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1506.02385 (2015).

[DL94] R. Durrett and S. Levin, *The importance of being discrete (and spatial)*, Theoretical Population Biology **46** (1994), no. 3, 363 – 394.

[EHS15] S. N. Evans, A. Hening, and S. J. Schreiber, *Protected polymorphisms and evolutionary stability of patch-selection strategies in stochastic environments*, Journal of Mathematical Biology **71(2)** (2015), 325–359.

[ERSS13] S. N. Evans, P. Ralph, S. J. Schreiber, and A. Sen, *Stochastic population growth in spatially heterogeneous environments*, Journal of Mathematical Biology **66** (2013), no. 3, 423–476.

[FOT10] M. Fukushima, Y. Oshima, and M. Takeda, *Dirichlet forms and symmetric markov processes*, vol. 19, Walter de Gruyter, 2010.

[GZ06] F. Gesztesy and M. Zinchenko, *On spectral theory for schrödinger operators with strongly singular potentials*, Mathematische Nachrichten **279** (2006), no. 9-10, 1041–1082.

[HO00] I. Hanski and O. Ovaskainen, *The metapopulation capacity of a fragmented landscape*, Nature **404** (2000), no. 6779, 755–758.

[Hut11] M. Hutzenthaler, *Supercritical branching diffusions in random environment*, Electron. Commun. Probab **16** (2011), no. 2.

[Kol09] M. Kolb, *On the large time behavior of diffusions*, Dissertation, Kaiserslautern.

[KS12] M. Kolb and D. Steinsaltz, *Quasilimiting behavior for one-dimensional diffusions with killing*, The Annals of Probability **40** (2012), no. 1, 162–212.

[KT81] S. Karlin and H. Taylor, *A second course in stochastic processes*, Academic Press, Orlando, 1981.

[KT83] S. Karlin and S. Tavaré, *A class of diffusion processes with killing arising in population genetics*, SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics **43** (1983), no. 1, 31–41.

[Lam05] A. Lambert, *The branching process with logistic growth*, The Annals of Applied Probabability **15** (2005), no. 2, 1506–1535.

[LB10] L. Lorenzi and M. Bertoldi, *Analytical methods for markov semigroups*, CRC Press, 2010.

[Lit12] J. Littin, *Uniqueness of quasistationary distributions and discrete spectra when is an entrance boundary and 0 is singular*, Journal of Applied Probability **49** (2012), no. 3, 719–730.

[LM09] X. Li and X. Mao, *Population dynamical behavior of non-autonomous Lotka-Volterra competitive system with random perturbation*, Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems. Series A **24** (2009), no. 2, 523–545.

[LWW11] M. Liu, K. Wang, and Q. Wu, *Survival analysis of stochastic competitive models in a polluted environment and stochastic competitive exclusion principle*, Bulletin of Mathematical Biology **73** (2011), no. 9, 1969–2012.

[Man61] P. Mandl, *Spectral theory of semi-groups connected with diffusion processes and its application*, Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal **11** (1961), no. 4, 558–569.

[MSM01] S. Martínez and J. San Martín, *Rates of decay and h-processes for one dimensional diffusions conditioned on non-absorption*, Journal of Theoretical Probability **14** (2001), no. 1, 199–212.

[Muc72] B. Muckenhoupt, *Hardy's inequality with weights*, Studia Mathematica **1** (1972), no. 44, 31–38.

[MV12] S. Méléard and D. Villemonais, *Quasi-stationary distributions and population processes*, Probability Surveys **9** (2012), 340–410.

[Myt96] L. Mytnik, *Superprocesses in random environments*, The Annals of Probability **24** (1996), no. 4, 1953–1978.

[Pin95] R. G. Pinsky, *Positive harmonic functions and diffusion*, vol. 45, Cambridge university press, 1995.

[Pin09] ———, *Explicit and almost explicit spectral calculations for diffusion operators*, Journal of Functional Analysis **256** (2009), no. 10, 3279–3312.

[SE04] D. Steinsaltz and S. N. Evans, *Markov mortality models: implications of quasistationarity and varying initial distributions*, Theoretical Population Biology **65** (2004), no. 4, 319–337.

[SE07] D. Steinsaltz and S. Evans, *Quasistationary distributions for one-dimensional diffusions with killing*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society **359** (2007), no. 3, 1285–1324.

[Sim93] B. Simon, *Large time behavior of the heat kernel: On a theorem of Chavel and Karp*, Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society **118** (1993), no. 2, 513–514.

[Wei67] J. Weidmann, *Zur Spektraltheorie von Sturm-Liouville-operatoren*, Mathematische Zeitschrift **98** (1967), no. 4, 268–302.

[Wei12] ———, *Linear operators in Hilbert spaces*, vol. 68, Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.

[Wie85] N. Wielens, *The essential self-adjointness of generalized schrödinger operators*, Journal of functional analysis **61** (1985), no. 1, 98–115.

Department of Statistics, 1 South Parks Road, Oxford OX1 3TG, United Kingdom
E-mail address: hening@stats.ox.ac.uk

Department of Mathematics, University of Paderborn, Warburger Str. 100, 33098 Paderborn, Germany
E-mail address: kolb@math.uni-paderborn.de